DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 493 RC 012 046

TITLE	National Rural Communities Facilities Assessment Study. Report on the Conference (Austin, Texas, December 13-15, 1978).
INSTITUTION	National Rural Center, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. Farmers Home Administration.
PUB DATE	Feb 79
NOTE	142p.; Maybe marginally legible due to light print.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Communications; *Community Services; Costs; *Delivery Systems; Education; Energy; Facilities; *Facility Planning; Health; Housing; Human Services; Justice; *Needs Assessment; *Policy Formation; Rural Areas; *Rural Development; Rural Population; Safety; Transportation; Utilities; Wastes

ABSTRACT

An 18-month National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Study, commissioned by the Farmers Home Administration and conducted by Abt Associates, Inc. will assess community facilities serving rural populations and identify the types and extent of investment in facilities necessary to provide an adequate flow of services to these populations. In order to provide assistance and direction to this major policy research effort, the National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Conference was convened in Austin, Texas. The Conference brought together experts in 10 facility areas (safety, justice, water and waste water, energy, housing, communications, health, education, solid waste, and transportation). The Conference generated advice on what facilities and what characteristics and physical services contribute most to the provision of basic human and physical services in rural communities, and guidance to determine if and how those characteristics can be measured. The report includes a summary of the conference proceedings, presentations, panel reports, a list of participants, a list of federal representatives, and a list of organizations, agencies and institutions contacted for nominations. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187493

[redacted]

RC 012046

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Victoria Hays

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Rural Communities Facilities
Assessment Study

Report on the Conference at Austin, Texas

December 13 - 15, 1978

Prepared by the National Rural Center

for

Abt Associates Inc.

and

Farmers Home Administration

February 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
Summary of Conference Proceedings 5
Opening Remarks of Dr. Benjamin Chinitz 6
Opening Remarks of John M. Cornman 10
Luncheon Comments by James E. Thornton 13
Closing Remarks of Dr. Benjamin Chinitz 18
Closing Remarks of Louis D. Higgs 19
Panel Reports 21
Educational Panel Report 23
Solid Waste Panel Report 31
Water Supply and Wastewater Panel Report 35
Energy Panel Report 43
Telecommunications Panel Report 51
Justice Panel Report 63
Health Panel Report 79
Safety Panel Report 87
Housing Panel Report 93
Transportation Panel Report 101
Industrial Parks Panel Report 107
Recreation Panel Report 111
Conference Participants ---
  Groups Contacted for Conference Nominations 117
Bio-Sketches of Participants 119
Groups Contacted for Conference Nominations 143
Federal Participants 144

INTRODUCTION

The National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Conference was held in Austin, Texas December 13-15, 1978. The Austin Conference brought together experts in ten facility areas: safety, justice, water and wastewater, energy, housing, communications, health, education, solid waste, and transportation. Two other facility areas - recreation and industrial parks, were discussed at a mini-conference in Columbia, Maryland on January 11, 1979.

These conferences were convened to provide assistance and direction to a major policy research effort commissioned by the Farmers Home Administration and conducted by Abt Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, Massachusetts. The National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Study will assess community facilities serving rural populations and identify the types and extent of investment in facilities necessary to provide an adequate flow of services to these populations. The goal of the 18-month study is to discover what kinds of communities have the least satisfactory services; which services, measured across community types, are most in need of improvement; what costs would be incurred in attempting to bring community facilities into line with some minimum acceptable level for such services; and which of these problems and associated costs are most important in light of both national and community preferences.

The study is divided into two phases: Phase I is a design phase, while Phase II is the phase when the actual assessment will be carried out according to the design developed in Phase I.

The National Rural Center, as a subcontractor to Abt Associates Inc., had the responsibility of marshalling "community and technical" input into the study. The primary purpose of the conference held in Austin and Columbia was to give Abt Associates, and through them, the Farmers Home Administration, advice on what facilities and what characteristics and physical services contribute most to the provision of basic human and physical services in rural communities, and guidance to determine if and how those characteristics can be measured.

More than fifty organizations, agencies, and institutions were consulted to obtain nominations for the conferences. A conscious effort was made to invite participants with expertise in a particular facility area, as well as breadth of knowledge about rural development in general. In addition, diversity was sought in regard to geographical, demographical, and ethnic representation. Because the mini-conference was not centrally located, participation was drawn from the East Coast.

Both conferences were structured around functionally-related small groups. Performance criteria and secondary data papers were presented to the participants prior to their arrival, along with background materials about the study. The papers were intended to be points of departure for the small group discussions. Some groups generally endorsed them, some dismissed them, and others discussed and refined the major service and physical characteristics described in them. Each small group (panel) had a facilitator to elicit contributions from the participants. An agenda for discussion was suggested by the conference organizers, but each panel had the discretion to shape its own agenda in accomplishing the tasks of the conference. The following questions were suggested to the panel facilitators:

1) What are the most important characteristics of the service(s) which a given facility provides?

2) What are the best ways to describe and measure those important service characteristics?

3) What are the most important physical characteristics of the facility which contribute to that service?

4) What are the best ways to describe and measure those physical characteristics?

5) What are the most important facilities in a given facility area on which better information is needed, and is that information currently available for the purposes of this study?

Case studies of two smaller communities were presented to participants in Austin as a point of reference for discussing these case studies. Policy considerations and concerns about the focus or methodology of the study were points for major discussion in some of the panels; the panels convened in Columbia had insufficient time to explore all of these concerns. There was general agreement that the flexibility afforded the panels resulted in very useful contributions to the study.

The small group process worked well for the following reasons:

- Facilitators had an orientation session prior to the conference to discuss the purposes and approaches of the study and conference which was led by Jim Godwin of the Manpower Development Corporation, an experienced and resourceful leader.

- The facilitators had a firm knowledge of their facility area and helped stimulate the discussion by the participants.

- Participants brought to their task an exceptional degree of expertise in rural development and a strong commitment to improve the quality of life for rural citizens.

- Participants enjoyed meeting with experts from various parts of the nation and from various disciplines.

- The mental discipline and considered advice required by the process on the part of the participants exceeded the expectations of the conference planners.

A recorder was assigned by Abt Associates Inc. to each of the panels, who in most instances had the responsibility for incorporating the input from the panel into the study design. The fact that panel agendas differed made for an overall report which lacked a uniform style and format. Nevertheless, each of the reports should provide a sense of the conferences' deliberations and conclusions.

Feedback from various persons involved in the conference has been positive. The remarks by Dr. Benjamin Chinitz, Vice President of Abt Associates, Inc., and Louis Higgs, project study director of the Farmers Home Administration made at the conclusion of the Austin conference, state well the sense that this consultative process has been successful. In summary, the conference accomplished a number of useful things.

- Some good advice was provided on the value of existing data in developing physical characteristics and descriptions of facilities which would have the most impact on services.
- Caveats and guidelines for both the design and use of the results of the study were generated.
- Rural development policy issues and concerns surfaced in many of the discussions.
- Elements of a useful rural development agenda were brought out.
- A number of resource people who could and are generally willing to make substantial contributions to the study have been identified.

The Farmers Home Administration and Abt Associates Inc., are committed to continuing the consultative process which has begun in Austin and Columbia, though it is too early to define how that process will take shape.

This conference report includes a summary of the conference proceedings, presentations made at the Austin Conference, panel reports, a list of participants, a list of Federal representatives, and a list of organizations, agencies, and institutions contacted for nominations.

Comments about this report should be directed to:

Larry Newlin, Conference Coordinator
National Rural Center
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Comments and questions about the study should be addressed to:

Dr. Benjamin Chinitz, Vice President
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02136

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Prepared by the Staff of the National Rural Center

Because of the great diversity between all the various facility areas, it is very difficult to develop summary statements that reflect the consensus of the conference participants. Nevertheless, the conference organizers discerned several themes which should offer guidance to the Farmers Home Administration and Abt Associates, Inc., in the conduct of this study. It should also aid Federal development agencies in their efforts to collect and analyze information for the purpose of making policy decisions that will affect rural America.

1) With few exceptions the conference participants were in agreement that development strategies and priorities must be made locally by those people for whom development has the greatest impact.

2) These development decisions are difficult to make and therefore require that a full range of information be made available to local development practitioners so as to inform their communities of the implications that these decisions will have on their lives.

3) One element of these informational requirements is certainly the capital costs of upgrading community facilities. This data, however, is of limited value in most instances without additional information on anticipated operating costs, changes in the tax base, anticipated growth rate, alternative service delivery technologies, community preferences, etc.

4) The participants were encouraged with the statements made by Federal officials that the Farmers Home Administration was becoming a more effective advocate for rural people, while at the same time increasing its effectiveness as a development agency. In order to fulfill this role as a development agency, however, it was generally felt that the agency should seek to develop a comprehensive local-state-Federal information collection system which would not only assist in determining national priorities but could also be used to determine local priorities.

5) The participants suggested that the Farmers Home Administration understand that a study such as this can provide a limited set of data requirements and that any policy decisions that are made as a result of this study be made cautiously and with further consultation.

6) Lastly, the majority of participants cautioned both Abt and FmHA that statements of what "should" exist be avoided and that the use of Federal or state standards in determing acceptable levels of performance be done with great care in those cases where the standards reflect an urban rather than a rural environment.

Opening Remarks of Dr. Benjamin Chinitz,
Vice President of Abt Associates Inc.
(December 13, 1978)

On behalf of Abt Associates, the prime contractor for the National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Study, I would like to welcome you to this unique conference. I want to thank you now for taking time from your busy lives to participate in a process which we are certain will contribute significantly to the success of this study.

This is a pioneering effort. For the first time, an attempt will be made to document on a national basis and state by state the status of community facilities in rural communities, to estimate the shortfalls by type of facility and by kind of place, develop some approaches to casting out these shortfalls and setting priorities. Every step in the process is a big one in relation to the starting point -- the current state of the art and knowledge. The purpose of this conference is to get your help in taking the very first step -- identifying the measures we will use to describe the existing inventory.

The typical study does not solicit input from so many people from such diverse backgrounds so early in the game. We and Farmers Home Administration have chosen to do so in this case because we have no illusions about the limits of pure research and social science in resolving the complex issues which have to be confronted in this study. Your input is critical, and we need it now.

This study has been launched at a critical time in the evolution of public policy with respect to rural America. The nation and the current administration are preoccupied with the battle against inflation. The current strategy calls for fiscal and monetary restraint and voluntary price and wage controls. Fiscal restraint means holding down the budget deficit, and that means holding down federal expenditures. Monetary restraint means very high interest rates. Both factors fiscal and monetary restraint pose a threat to the allocation of resources for community facilities, in both urban and rural America.

In addition, the nation and the administration are concerned about the low rate of growth in the economy (GNP) which in turn reflects a sharp decline in the rate of growth of productivity and that in turn reflects in part -- a sluggish and unsatisfactory rate of private investment in plant and equipment. That kind of concern also poses a challenge to greater investment in public capital, i.e., community facilities.

And there is a third dimension to our national economic problem which competes for national attention and that is high unemployment. The best we seem to be capable of in the new circumstances is 5.8% unemployment and that translates to a few million more workers than used to be unemployed in recovery periods -- and that translates into large claims on the federal budget for unemployment insurance, manpower training, welfare, and social services.

All of these pressures (against more capital investment in community facilities) increase the urgency of conducting a study which will document the gaps in the inventory of public capital in rural America, capital which is essential to the productivity of the private sector and thereby contributes indirectly to the standard of living and contributes directly to the standard of living, in terms of quality of life.

There are other factors which call attention to the timeliness and the importance of this study. Ever since this administration took office beginning in January 1977, there has been an almost continuous debate and dialogue on how best to reshape both the substance and the form and structure of federal policy and programs in the domain of community and economic development. Early on, the President created the Urban and Regional Policy Group, which ultimately gave birth (a cesarian birth) in March 1978 to an (urban) policy, most of which has not yet been enacted or otherwise implemented. The White House Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development was convened in late January and early February 1978 and has since published its proceedings, focusing on problems of both decline and growth in both rural and urban America.

The President campaigned on a platform of reorganization and immediately set up a reorganization staff in the Office of Management and Budget and put Community and Economic Development on the agenda for early action. That pregnancy is now in its 23rd month and while there have been frequent labor pains -- some very recently -- it is much too early to buy the cigars, much less pass them out. We certainly can't predict the sex of the child to be born or whether it will have any sex at all.

Regardless of the outcome of the Office of Management and Budget reorganization effort, the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) is in a dynamic posture with respect to its role and responsibilities in community economic development. The Rural Development Service has been integrated into Farmers Home Administration, and the new Farmers Home Administration under new leadership and with a new mandate is determined to become a development agency which anticipates and responds to the needs of rural people and rural communities in cooperation with state government. The study is an absolute prerequisite for the fulfillment of these aspirations.

The study comes at a time of dynamic change in geographic patterns of growth. Between 1960 and 1970, metropolitan counties (as a group) grew four times as fast as non-metro counties (Annual 1.6 vs. .4) but since 1970 -- non-metro counties have grown three times as fast as they did in the '60s and one and one-half times as fast as metro counties (1.2 vs. .8). Moreover, the contrast between the '60s and the '70s is greatest -- for the so-called non-adjacent, non-metro counties (1.1 vs. .1); counties with cities no greater than 2,500 (1.3 vs. .3); counties with lowest densities (1.6 vs. .1); and the poorer (.7 vs. 1.1).

However we ultimately go about the task of estimating shortfalls in the inventory of community facilities, (it should be obvious that) these trends and what they portend for the future will critically shape our conclusions.

Let me quickly cite three other factors which will complicate our task but at the same time make it more challenging -- technological progress and the implementation of existing technology in the (management and) delivery of services will have enormous impacts on the demands and needs for community facilities -- required to support these services. The potential of cable TV, for example, boggles the mind. Second, regulations - (and the changing tides...) which affects standards. Third, expectations - shifting priorities.

For all these reasons, we at Abt Associates, feel priviledged and challenged by the assignment of conducting the National Rural Community Facilities Assessment Study. We have as a company (over the last decade) been involved in a variety of large scale social experiments and evaluations for a number of federal agencies. But rarely, if ever, have we been asked to undertake such a critical project at such a critical time in the life of our client, in this case, the Farmers Home Administration.

We are pleased to have had the National Rural Center working with us in planning and conducting this important conference. We have been working very hard together with our subcontractors to prepare materials for this conference.

The study has barely begun. We were awarded the contract on September 27 and began work in October. We defined three initial tasks which are also the subject of this conference.

(1) When you look at a community and inquire about the adequacy of services -- health, education, transportation, waste disposal, recreation, etc. what questions do you ask? What are the criteria by which you measure the quality of these services? What indicators would you use. (2) How do you translate those measures of services into criteria, measures, indicators, characteristics of physical facilities so that one can appraise the facilities (as opposed to the services) which are the object of Farmers Home Administration financing? (3) What is the availability of secondary data, or do we need primary data.

Unless and until we can solve these issues, we cannot proceed to carry out the assessment. There will be other major problems to solve, and I'm sure you could help us with all of them -- but right now we need your help to make that first step.

Multiple clients

As you proceed with the task, please bear in mind that our goal and that of FmHA is to produce a study which will be of value to a wide variety of users.

FmHA is just one of many federal agencies which fund community facilities in rural areas, and we wnat to keep their needs in mind as well. Regional Planning Commissions (ARC and Title V) have a fairly obvious stake in this enterprise since they are obliged to identify priorities for public investment in their respective areas. Similarly state and sub-state planning districts have a strong interest.

At a minimum, the methodology which we are trying to develop with your help will be of great potential value even if the estimates are not detailed enough for specific areas.

So, on with the task, and once again, our sincere thanks for your contribution.

Opening Remarks of John M. Cornman,
President of the National Rural Center
(December 13, 1978)

Welcome, welcome to what I believe to be something of a first, or at least a rarity. Let me explain.

Two-and-a half years with the National Rural Center have confirmed the following observations about life in Washington:

(1) Do-gooders like to meet, or are at least fearful of missing someone else's meeting.

(2) Those who would do nothing about a problem endlessly debate definitions -- what is a small farm, what is development, what is rural? What is a performance criteria?

(3) When government doesn't know what else to do, it convenes a conference, creates a commission, funds a study, or takes an assessment.

Now, please consider this, you are attending a government funded conference ... organized by a do-gooder organization ... at which you will be debating descriptions and definitions ... to be used in a government-funded National Rural Communities Facilities Assessment Study.

Now all of us have attended events which reflected one, two or three of those quaint Washington traits, but I challenge you to recall another event which you attended which could be said to include almost everyone of them. That could make this event about as rare in the world of do-gooders and government as well, the best analogy which comes to mind is ice hockey. It's rare in that sport when a player scores three goals in one game. That's called the hat trick. This conference might be said to be equivalent to a hat trick plus two -- and that is rare. But, beware, you will not have legitimate rights to brag about being part of a two hat trick event unless you stay the full two-and-a half days.

More important, if you do participate fully, I think you will find that you have been engaged in an excercise -- more correctly, an experiment -- which is unique in a very useful way.

And, now, let me explain that as quickly as I can.

Those who would do nothing about rural problems have another common theme. They say they lack the data on which to base sound policies. Unhappily, they are correct more often than not.

Unemployment and underemployment figures for rural areas are inadequate; there is much we do not know about the reverse migration; is it a capital shortage or a technical assistance shortage which slows or prohibits economic development; who are the small farm families and what do they grow; do we need more doctors or more clean water in rural areas? How many of what kinds of community facilities exist in rural areas? The list goes on and on, and those of us who believe that there ought to be a national rural development strategy responsive to the needs of persons at the lower end of the economic scale are left both frustrated with inadequate information with which to battle the nay-sayers and budget-cutters and made nervous by those who would launch new initiatives based more on hope than experience.

Today, in Washington, there is renewed interest in rural America, and as a result there is something of a competition going on to see which of several agencies will come up with the winning, not necessarily the best -- recommendations for a federal rural initiative. And if the winning initiative fails because it is poorly conceived for a lack of good information, it may be a long time before a similar opportunity comes along.

As Dr. Chinitz noted, the Farmers Home Administration is one of the actors who would like a greater rural development responsibility. However, you may view that idea, you should give Farmers Home credit for attempting to help close the information gap as it develops a rural strategy.

And because Farmers Home is almost alone in this approach to developing a sound rural policy, that makes this conference a unique experience in helping design a rural data collection process.

Our task in this effort is to provide advice - advice, not speeches, not charges, not recommendations - but advice on the kinds of questions which should be asked if the proposed survey is to give accurate and useful information about what community facilities exist and do in rural areas ... information which once collected can help policy makers target resources to meet priority needs. Unless we know what is out there, not just in raw numbers, but in relationship to the delivery of services, we will not be able to determine priorities and shape programs to attain development goals. And this is why NRC agreed to play a role in this project.

The primary purpose, then, of this conference is to give Abt Associates, and through them, the Farmers Home Administration, guidance on what facilities and what characteristics of those facilities contribute most to the provision of basic human and physical services in rural communities and guidance on if and how those characteristics can be measured.

In pursuit of that goal, we need the following kinds of advice from you. We need:

(1) Advice on the best way to describe the quality of a particular service in a rural community? Access, reliability, cost, others?

(2) Advice on which of those descriptive characteristics can be measured and how. Does access mean travel time, waiting time, constant availability? Or what?

(3) Advice on if and how those measurements can be reflected in an inventory of community facilities.

(4) To the extent possible, advice on the kinds of questions which ought to be asked to collect this kind of information. Do we need to count more than fire engines to have an accurate idea of the level of fire protection available to rural areas?

(5) Because it will not be possible to survey all 54 facilities, we need advice on which of the community facilities listed are the most important and ought to be surveyed.

(6) And finally, if time permits, we want your comments on the adequacy of existing survey information listed at the conclusion of each subject area.

To accomplish this task you will be divided into and, for the most part, remain in a task group concerned with a particular facilities group. Each of you have been assigned to a task group dealing with a subject about which you are knowledgeable.

While the group facilitators have been given a suggested strategy for proceeding, it is expected that different groups will adopt different strategies. At some point, however, we would like each task group to compare its service characteristics of a community's facilities with those in the papers prepared by Abt Associates.

That then is your charge -- to provide guidance on what facilities and on what characteristics of those facilities are most important to delivering basic physical and human services in rural communities, and guidance on how these characteristics can be measured.

And I hope you appreciate the potential importance of our undertaking, for I suspect that such an understanding will be needed to carry groups through some very frustrating moments.

Going in, we know that some subject areas lend themselves to this kind of consideration better than others.

We know that it is more difficult to deal with descriptions and definitions than with facts and figures.

We know it is easier to express opinions than to give considerate advice.

And so we know that we are asking a lot of you -- not only considerable mental discipline, but also willingness to move beyond your knowledge of a particular area of the country to consideration which encompasses the diversity found in rural America.

And finally, we are aware that the ultimate usefulness of the products of your deliberation is out of your hands and will not be known until sometime in the future -- when the survey is completed - or when a policy maker makes use or fails to make use of information collected in this survey.

For those of us who require short term rewards, we trust you will learn something from the discussions and get to know some interesting new acquaintances.

Failing that you will at least have the right to brag ... or complain about ... participating in an event that covered at least two hat tricks worth of truisms about do-gooders and government.

Thank you.

LUNCHEON COMMENTS BY JAMES E. THORNTON, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

(December 14, 1978)

First, let me say how much I appreciate all of you being here in Austin to aid us in designing a meaningful study of community facilities in rural America, one that will be useful to us both on a national and state level.

The elected officials here...officers of counties and municipalities..the representatives from rural organizations...planners...all too often you're not consulted on the decisions in Washington that affect your lives and your livelihoods. That is the reason that FmHA's administrator, Gordon Cavanaugh, and I insisted on this meeting and further consultation with the people most directly affected. With your help I believe we can design a study that will do things for you, instead of to you.

And so today I'm not going to describe the study. The study is an evolving entity that will be shaped by your contributions and your experiences, among other things. But I would like to tell you how important I think it is.

Let me begin by drawing on some of the things that I found serving on the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, as executive director of the Federal Advisory Committee on National Growth Policy Processes, and on the Senate Agriculture Committee staff.

One of the things we found is that we simply didn't know much about the conditions of life in rural America. We know how many people there are, and where they are, but we don't know what kind of amenities and necessities -- those things that make life livable and worthwhile -- are out there. We not only don't know it now, at a discrete point in time, we have no idea of what we're going to need five, ten, twenty years from now when there will be a lot more people -- and industry -- in rural America than there are now.

This lack of essential data confronted Gordon Cavanaugh and me when we took over the reins of Farmers Home in 1977. In the past, that was perhaps not so important, because the agency was a project-oriented agency, and it certainly got the projects built, whether a water and sewer system, rural housing, a fire station or what-have-you.

But a rural development agency is different from a project agency, and a rural development agency is what Farmers Home Administration is now. And if you are serious about rural development, about meeting local needs and national objectives in rural America, you need sound data. You need it not only on a current basis, which is one of the things our study will provide, but you need it on a continuing basis, and you need access to it for both micro and macro planning. This is the basic reason behind the commissioning of this study with Abt Associates which, eventually, will provide the first integrated, federal-state-local data system for community facilities in rural America.

As I said earlier, our prime task in Farmers Home is shaping it into a rural development agency; an advocate and resource for rural people in the federal establishment. This role has been a long time coming:

In 1970, the U.S. Congress stated that rural-urban balance is "so essential to peace, prosperity and welfare of all our citizens that highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural America."

In 1977, we began our examination of Farmers Home Administration by recognizing that President Jimmy Carter and Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland subscribe wholeheartedly to this policy statement of the Congress and are deeply committed to bringing about such a sound rural-urban balance.

Congress provided tools and money to achieve this balance in the Rural Development Act of 1972.

But not until this Administration came into office did the Executive Branch of our federal government give Farmers Home Administration a green light to move ahead aggressively and fully implement the Act of 1972.

To accomplish this, we are redistributing the FmHA workload and relocating some offices and personnel. When completed, the changes we're making will:

-- cordinate FmHA work with local and regional development agencies

-- revamp FmHA field offices and structure and staff them in support of our new program and development objectives.

Here's how it will work.

In general, FmHA county offices will be responsible only for farm and housing loans to individual families.

A new type of substate FmHA district office will take over the processing of loans for organization, community and, eventually, the business and industrial projects now being handled in the state offices.

This will relieve county offices of the overload of duties that has mounted in recent years when county offices were responsible for every type of service except business loans.

The volume of FmHA programs continues to grow -- and will expand even more, and faster, in the future. This is too great a workload for county offices to handle. For example, in prior years the total loan and grant programs of Farmers Home were running about $5.5 billion.

Under this administration, program levels have doubled. Loans and grants in fiscal year 1978 exceeded $11 billion. They will probably exceed $12 billion in fiscal 1979.

By concentrating on individual farm and housing loans, county offices will be able to improve service to individuals and families in need of those programs.

At the same time, shifting of group and community loans to district offices will increase the agency's efficiency and expertise in these more complex, but less-frequently used, programs.

Nationally, district offices will serve an area that is coterminous (or has the same boundaries) with state planning districts. This will allow Farmers Home to improve the quality and quantity of its rural development leadership responsibilities. Planning districts and related local governments, or small governments lacking professional development staffs, will continue to work with nearby FmHA offices.

Our restructuring procedure is further complicated by staffing problems.

As you know, this Administration is determined to lick inflation. Every federal agency is committed to holding down spending. As I said earlier, heavy constraints are placed on hiring and filling job vacancies. Although Congress has authorized both additional funds and more people for us, the likelihood of our being able to completely match personnel needs with program requirements does not appear in the immediate offing.

Meanwhile, we are faced in some cases with "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Individuals are moved from one office to staff another. The net effect is that we are spreading our total staff extremely thin and this could severely limit our implementation of new programs.

Restructuring will help us do a better job of targeting our program funds and other resources to provide maximum assistance to disadvantaged people and distressed communities.

Restructuring also will make it possible for us to coordinate our efforts with planning and development objectives of state and local agencies.

In the past, Farmers Home Administration programs have operated with considerable autonomy. We have not always been adequately sensitive to the broader development implications of our investment decisions. We have not really considered whether FmHA investments supported -- or ignored -- or even took note of the priorities and projects of substate development staffs -- or even of other programs of the agency.

This is what we're changing. By itself, Farmers Home does not now have the complete range of tools needed to be a comprehensive development agency. But we have many major components that add up to the single largest federal financial development package available to rural areas today.

We must, therefore, spend our available dollars wisely. When we look at the great and varied need for community facilities in rural America, it is doubtful we have funds enough to meet a great many long term deficiencies.

States do have planning objectives -- some of them staffed out. They have established priorities in many cases. They also have control of some federal and state funds to carry out comprehensive development. We hope, by working with designated state development agencies, to be able to develop joint strategies that will enable FmHA and states to work together in such a way that mutual interests and goals are attained more quickly and efficiently. We also would thereby greatly augment and extend our total funding capability.

We are not asking states to manage or allocate FmHA funds. What we are asking is that states sit down with us to discuss their plans, goals and priorities so we can determine the most effective way to fit our programs into state planning.

We see this as an ongoing consultation process, with states taking the initiative, as many are now doing, to get the process started.

Ideally, we would like to see each state establish state development priorities for their rural areas, based on local and area priorities, and then cooperate with Farmers Home to develop joint federal-state-local investment strategies to meet these priorities.

Also, we would like to see states encourage and strengthen local nonmetropolitan governments, so they, too, can plan and implement development programs at their level.

FmHA restructuring is a major, first step to help bring about such coordinated planning and action.

We have asked each FmHA state director to establish a direct line of communication and consultation with the Governor's office, industrial development authorities, departments of community affairs, and other state government officials who are responsible for state community development programs.

The state director will be the key FmHA official who decides when, how, and to what extent Farmers Home programs mesh with state rural development goals and plans.

We intend to bring into the rural development process all public and private interest groups who have an interest and resources to offer. In addition, we will draw on the total resources of USDA and other federal agencies.

Let me speak frankly. In my opinion, unless we do work more closely together, we will never succeed in achieving the sound rural-urban balance that Congress mandated in 1970.

Historically, in every state there tends to be a concentration of power, expertise and know-how in the urban areas and big cities. Therefore, everyone who has a concern and understanding of the problems of small communities is needed on the rural development team.

We need more comprehensive planning. We need more coordinated state and local action. We need more outreach. And we need the information that the community facilities study will supply.

Thank you.

CLOSING REMARKS OF DR. BENJAMIN CHINITZ, VICE PRESIDENT OF ABT ASSOCIATES INC.

(December 15, 1978)

Let me apply the jargon of the study to the assessment of this Conference, i.e., performance indicators. Here are the questions I would pose:

1. Did we receive solid advice on the selection of facilities to be included in or excluded from the Study?

2. Did we get concrete help with the identification of variables by which to describe and assess the existing inventory of facilities?

3. Did we learn more than we already knew about existing sources of data on facilities which may satisfy our data requirements for specific facilities?

4. Did we enlarge our understanding of the realities and dynamics of rural America, its people and institutions?

5. Did we meet a large number of people, and were we referred to still other people who will be of invaluable assistance to us as we proceed through the next stages of this effort?

To all these questions (and others of a similar nature which might be asked), the answer is a resounding

YES!

and for this we thank you all.

We would also like to believe that judged from your personal perspectives the Conference will have proved valuable beyond the contribution you have made to the Study.

Once again, we want to thank the National Rural Center for the splendid planning and execution of the Conference and Farmers Home Administration for its support which extends far beyond the financial dimension.

CLOSING REMARKS OF LOUIS D. HIGGS,

STUDY PROJECT DIRECTOR, FmHA

(December 15, 1978)

I would like, if I may, to make a few personal remarks about this conference. Every once in a while, we all make a high risk decision which pays off. When we do, we like to "crow" a little, not so much to brag, but more to share the excitement of having something we believed in turn out right.

This study was more or less mandated, and when I asked to get involved, these things became clear:

-- Regardless of how the study would be conducted, a substantial amount of money would have to be spent just to meet the mandate; however, the study could be made useful to many people for many purposes. For example, to the policy and program planning staffs of many Federal and State agencies, and to the research and analysis community, both in and out of government.

-- Assessment is an art not a science; even though it may use many scientific and systematic methods, it inevitably involves judgment; moreover, it is a very difficult art which requires very sophisticated judgements. Therefore, the design and conduct of the study would need all the experience and wisdom it could muster from a variety of perspectives.

-- Finally, while not a policy study in the sense of developing options or making recommendations, the way in which the study is defined and conducted would obviously have a substantial impact on both policy and program planning and management. Therefore, it was important to have an open process in which the various stakeholders could make inputs.

For these reasons, I proposed that a requirement for a very extensive consultative process be written into any contract that was issued. I ran into a great deal of opposition, not in principle, but on very practical grounds. No one quarreled with the need or with my reasoning. Rather, they pointed out that it was too time consuming, too expensive, too much overhead, and most important of all, too dificult to do well.

Well, we have paid some short-term costs. Abt has had to devote valuable time to preparing for this conference, time that could have been spent doing more intensive analyses of statutes and regulations, of the literature in each functional area, and of the adequacy of available data.

Then, too, some argued that the required consultation should come later in the schedule, after Abt had completed all its homework. But, as someone who has spent most of the last ten years trying to work in the field of intergovernment relations, especially in trying to make Federal R&D more useful to State and local governments, I've learned the truth of that old political axiom, "them that ain't in on the takeoffs, ain't in on the landings." There's no sense in asking people's advice if you've already made up your mind or if they think you have. Well, we obviously haven't made up our minds. You are helping us taxi to the runway, you will be asked to help us on the takeoff, you will be used during the flight, and you can be in on the landing, although you may want to bail out if it looks like a crash landing.

Well, I won the battles. And after this first step, I ask myself whether this conference has been a success. Unlike Ben, I didn't use criteria to come up with the answer so maybe I can't answer that question. Let me just share with you some preliminary conclusions of mine. As a result of this conference:

- -- We will probably not do some of the things we thought we would probably do;
- -- we will probably do a few things which we hadn't even considered; and
- -- we will do a number of things differently and I believe much more effectively.

In addition to the rich education which I, and I believe most of you, received in the exchanges of views at this conference, we received and I think will be able to capture and disseminate:

- -- An important list of things that we need to know about rural development which we don't know systematically -- if you will, the elements of a pretty good rural development research agenda; and
- -- an important set of caveats and policy guidelines both for the conduct of our study and for a variety of aspects of rural development policy and programs.

So, I am very glad I fought and won the battle on a consultative process and am very grateful to you for making it, at least so far, the right decision.

One final note. Very few of you here besides the Abt and NRC people know the incredibly difficult job that Larry Newlin had and the difficult circumstances under which he had to do it in order to put on this conference. I want to get it officially on the record that he has truly done an outstanding job.

I want to do so for three reasons. (Being a trinitarian, I always have three reasons.) One, Larry, because you deserve it. Two, because after your introduction of Jack Cornman on Wednesday I thought you might be in trouble and need all the help you can get. And three, in hopes that everyone on the NRC staff and the facilitators will realize that it applies equally to them, and we all owe you a great debt of thanks.

EDUCATION PANEL REPORT

Introduction

The panel worked extremely well as a group. Participation was strong and generally goal-oriented. This was aided by a responsive Abt reporter who was able to provide instant feedback on design aspects of the study.

The composition of the panel was believed to have been weakest in regard to the lack of educational practitioners. A greater opportunity to interact with the conference as a whole would have been preferred, particularly as education is so inherently interrelated with other conference topic areas, e.g., transportation.

The panel believed a survey that addressed human resource and community characteristics as well as physical facilities, would be considerably stronger, and would yield information of greater interest to policy-makers, administrators and practitioners - i.e., it would be a considerably better multi-purpose instrument. There was real frustration at not being able to address the human element, but the group tried, and developed an instrument which it believed would provide useful information notwithstanding.

Panel observations regarding possible misuse of performance and facilities criteria

Minimum standards and Federal/State requirements can result and have resulted in undue hardships to rural areas. Most standards are urban-inspired and urban-affordable. Common urban/rural standards are inherently inequitable.

Any discussion of facilities criteria must give special recognition to particular needs and characteristics of rural areas where:

- Economies of scale do not always hold
- There is less money to put facilities into compliance or "up-to-standard"
- There is different typology
- Conventional urban operations may require radical organizational changes in rural areas
- Education is treated in a community setting, and schools may maximize community education resources.

Yet, if there were not some externally imposed standards or criteria, rural residents might not have access to some desirable resources and perspectives; e.g., Title IX has both positive and negative effects in rural areas.

Pages 21, 22 - blank

Need for a survey

There is no data regarding the state of rural educational facilities. The Abt survey would be providing baseline data that would not otherwise be available. It will also provide data that will be useful to other agencies concerned with rural education.

Survey should not be designed to enable Abt to identify shortfalls

The survey should be a neutral instrument. It should make sense on its face, but should present data in such a way that the data is not used to demonstrate "standardness" nor "sub-standardness" of rural facilities.

The data should be in a form to enable various audiences to make shortfall judgements based on their own perceptions of needs and realities.

Contribution of proposed survey instrument

The contribution of the Panel's proposed survey instrument (see attached matrix) is that it enables conversion analysis. Conversion analysis provides the opportunity to make judgements regarding what could be done with the facilities as well as what is being done.

Value of survey to FmHA

The type of survey proposed would enable the FmHA loan application reviewer to make judgements regarding whether or not a new facility is essential, or whether the perceived need could be met by alternative uses of existing facilities.

Value of survey approach general

The analytic tool proposed for the educational segment of the facilities study could be used equally well in other areas. For example, the transportation panel would have an instrument that would enable them to obtain data on possible multiple uses of transportation facilities, e.g. school buses.

Rejection of performance criteria for education facilities

In the course of the discussion, the Abt documents were not particularly useful, especially the facilities criteria document. The case studies were not used, but other kinds of case studies might have been.

The Panel rejected performance criteria for educational facilities. Performance standards were considered the prerogative criteria for agencies. Abt should not develop any national performance criteria for purposes of this survey. Such criteria would not be useful, and could be used against the interest of some rural schools. Abt could, however, assess the extent to which State and/or local standards are met. It could do this programmatically via achievement on competency-based examinations mandated by the state or local jurisdiction. (This was rejected by the Panel.) It could do this in terms of facilities via adherence to State or locally mandated health/safety/building code standards. (This was accepted by the Panel.)

Abt should develop some criteria regarding:

- Maximum desirable transit time to obtain access to desired facility service
- Percentage of potential clients that the system is able to serve, i.e., the system should be able to provide educational services to those who desire them.

Abt should observe what exists in terms of facilities. It should also have sufficient data to judge what could exist (via the conversion factor analysis).

Characteristics of Survey Instrument

The survey instrument must be sensitive to the needs for:

- functional conversion
- flexibility

This is because these are extremely important concepts to rural schools with limited student body populations and funds.

The survey should enable multiple usage analysis. It should enable analysis of what a facility could be used for as well as what it is being used for, e.g., an academic secondary school classroom could be used in the evenings as an academic continuing education classroom. It should ask what purpose space is serving, for what amounts of time.

Abt, when it considers potential conversion usages of space, should factor in:

- storage requirements
- conversion time required

Abt should survey facilities characteristics and options at the site; it should also ask about access to facilities away from the site. For example, should a school not have an industrial arts facility, Abt would ask whether it had access to one, and, if so, how long it would take to get there and by what mode of transportation.

Priorities

It was felt that no good secondary data sources exist. Beyond that, it was felt that everything was important because it is all integrated in rural areas. If one had to survey only one or two facilities, look at legally mandated ones, i.e., elementary and secondary schools.

Day care centers should be dropped because they are too difficult to survey or assess. Museums have a low priority, but the Panel felt that it would be useful to note the existence and location of these facilities.

Rules for Indicators of Facilities Standards

Use gross standard measures, i.e., major features that would typify compliance and/or minimum standards, e.g., wide doorways and ramps for handicapped (legislation), indoor plumbing, hot running water.

Want measures that are empirically reasonable, i.e., make a lot of sense on the surface, BUT are not defined in such a way that a facility could be judged substandard by lack of them alone.

(Use gross standard measures - major features that would typify compliance)

Health/Safety/Fire

Identify Rey H/S/F characteristics and train observer to survey adequacy.

Secondary data may exist in this area, but it would be too hard to access (e.g., state records).

Special Legislative Requirement

A. Federal requirement
    Special education
    Energy
    Others (?)

Identify several critical common characteristics of space that comply with regulations, e.g., wheel chair ramps, wide doors. Abt can glean these from regulations.

B. Any State/local requirements

- BUILDING FACILITIES STANDARDS, where they exist
- MANAGEMENT - unlikely to be used for instruction or recreation

- HEALTH - Infirmary space
  Clinic space
  (Differentiated from "program" space, e.g., health education program.)

- COUNSELING
  Where special type of facility may be required.

- FOOD PREPARATION/SERVICE SPACE
  Where kitchen or other special space may be required. Differentiated from program space, e.g., nutrition-education program space.

- LABS:
  - Music rooms
  - Arts rooms
  - Science labs
  - Technology-delivery labs
    - Audio-based labs, including language labs.
    - Computer-based labs
    - Other learning centers which require special equipment

- VOCATIONAL:
  - Business machine
  - Industrial arts
  - Home economics
  - Agriculture

- RECREATION:
  - Outdoor
    - Lighted
    - Unlighted
  - Indoor
  - Space available, but not in use.

Minimum Facility Criteria for Libraries

(Assume some community information center function; where there is no library in a community should consider access to library - transit time and service availability.)

1. Must be accessible to elderly and handicapped and/or special means of service such as taped books.

2. Shelving for 10,000 volumes (in areas where population is less than 5,000).

3. 1,000 square foot area for book space (can be multi-purpose in character)

1,800 square feet for other essential space areas:
Periodicals space
Study space
Public meeting room space
Bathrooms
2,800 square feet total

4. Location - near major traffic pattern areas, e.g., near post office and bank (where hacks first appear after the snow falls)

5. Telephone hookup

6. Contact with and access to larger resource facility

Additional Performance Criteria for Libraries

1. Hours of service which serve needs of community

2. Essential: Morning, after school closes, also, evening for working people.

3. Information and referral services to community.

4. Nonprint materials in library.

5. Access to larger collections

6. Card Catalog

7. Mobile collections. (Not necessary through bookmobiles. Could use mail.)

Museums

Ascertain what exists and where, but do not measure against any facilities criteria.

Day Care

Too difficult to survey

Some Issues

1. Whether to survey nonschool educational facilities, e.g., libraries, museums.

If so, how? Limit to facilities actually utilized? (Yes)

Expand to facilities potentially utilized, e.g., work places. (Judged not practicable)

2. Whether to survey regional educational resource facilities (e.g., intermediate service agencies. (Yes)

3. Whether to service home based facilities. (Yes, under guise of administrative space extended.)

4. Whether to survey mobile facilities. (Yes)

5. What about potential services provided by satellites/computers (other technology-based innovations)? (Note when facility/service space is or could be provided through access to these)

Space Uses and Observation Criteria

The matrix on the following page should be applied to each of the following kinds of educational services.

DAYCARE

ELEMENTARY
(Public and Private)
SECONDARY/VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION
(including home-based)

POST-SECONDARY
  Community College
  Higher Education
  Vocational Education/Technical

CONTINUING EDUCATION
  Basic Skills/Academic
  Community/Work-Related

SPECIALIZED FACILITIES
  Libraries
  Museums
  Intermediate Service Agencies (e.g., information resource services, special schools, etc.

	SPACE USES									
OBSERVATION CRITERIA	Special Services -counseling -health	Media Centers -libraries	Meeting Space (multi-purp.)	Faculty (incl. in-service)	Supply & Maint. (incl. toilets)	Labs (science/art/ music)	Administrative	Vocational	Recreation -indoor-lights -outdoor-lights	Academic
Licensing Requirements										
Safety Codes										
Health Codes										
Fire Codes										
Legislative Requirements (e.g., 504, Head Start)										
Legal Requirements (e.g., Constitution, equal rights)										
Association-negotiated requirements										
Minimum Regulations (Federal, State, Local)										
Transit (Time, Mode, Distance)										
Space -- sq. ft.										
Time -- min. input/ year/day										
Portable buildings										
Populations (Served, Drop-out, Special)										
Alternatives (Telephone, Media, Regional Phone, Computers)										
Community-Setting Characteristics										

SOLID WASTE PANEL REPORT

The Panel

Two of the panel members were experienced city managers, one was a third term mayor, and one was a county director of planning. Each had been directly involved with solid waste management, and one had participated in a major EPA-ICMA regional solid waste management study.

The panel organized their discussions around the following topics:

- Waste generators
- Collection systems
- Processing technology
- Transportation/transfer means
- Disposal alternatives
- Critical performance and facility dimensions
- Rural situation descriptions significant to solid waste management system design and performance
- Secondary data sources
- Solid waste disposal standards and regulations

Waste Generators

Major waste generators identified and discussed were:

- Households
- Community Services
- Industry
- Agriculture

Types of waste identified and discussed were:

- Household and community services garbage
- Industrial/construction materials and waste
- Hazardous/nonhazardous wastes
- Compact/bulky wastes
- Auto bodies

It was concluded that:

- Household and community services garbage varied little in composition except where manufacturing or construction was present, and that the amount generated was directly proportional to the population served.

- The disposal of hazardous wastes was the responsibility of the generator, not of the municipality.

- The abandoned car body problem was most troublesome in rural areas.

Collection

The principal points brought out in the discussion were:

- Frequency of collection was a function of climate, cost, and community desires.
- Private collection systems caused the city or county fewer labor/management problems than did municipal or county operated systems.
- Population density and topography were the principal cost variables.
- Ordinances and enforcement were important in attaining compliance in some sections of the country.
- Rural household waste was usually handled by dispersed collection boxes.

Processing

It was concluded that shredding and separation were too costly for the scale at which most rural solid waste disposal systems operated. It was pointed out, however, that some systems did separate out bulky materials (brush, construction materials, etc.) for separate handling, and that most collection systems provided periodic pickups for bulky household items (furniture, appliances, etc.).

Transportation/Transfer Means

The area's settlement pattern was cited as the key factor in cost and in determining the desirability of the use of transfer stations.

Disposal Alternatives

The panel agreed that current resource recovery technology was not feasible for most rural solid waste disposal systems. It was pointed out that even the larger scale operations are having serious problems and that the processes required more skills to operate than are available in most rural areas.

Incineration was judged by the panel to be too costly and too technical for most rural systems to operate at performance levels set by EPA.

Pyrolysis and other technological approaches were not sufficiently well developed for rural use according to the panel.

It was concluded that community pressures for frequent collection was balanced by its concern for increased costs of collection, and that community pressures were such as to keep the collection frequency sufficient to meet acceptable health and aesthetic standards.

It was agreed that, on the other hand, the community was a poor watchdog for landfill operations - that is, except for those who live adjacent to the landfill. It was agreed that as a minimum sanitary landfills should have:

- All weather access roads
- Perimeter fencing
- Controlled access
- Leachate control
- Daily soil covering
- Methane gas venting processors

Rural Situation Descriptors

The panel agreed that with respect to collection and transportation, climate, population level, and settlement patterns were the most significant situation descriptors. It was agreed that climate, soil conditions, and topography were the most important descriptors with respect to disposal sites.

Secondary Data Sources

The panel was of the opinion that existing state solid waste management plans were adequate for obtaining data needed to determine solid waste facility shortfalls. They suggested that the communities and areas surveyed be used to check the accuracy of the state plans and to develop correction factors to adjust the level of shortfall calculated from the state plan data.

Solid Waste Disposal Standards and Regulations

The panel felt very strongly that EPA solid waste regulations were unnecessarily stringent for many rural areas. It was their feeling that the current uniform standards could be replaced by a set of standards geared to conditions based on local climate, settlement patterns and population levels.

Other Conclusions

The panel felt that the federal government should bear the full cost of solid waste disposal research, but that the cost of demonstration projects be shared by the demonstration communities. They also felt that the demonstration communities should not have to bear the cost of failures, nor be penalized in a regulatory sense when the technology being demonstrated proved inadequate.

WATER SUPPLY AND WASTEWATER PANEL REPORT

The Panel

The panel for water supply and wastewater were combined because of the natural interface in problems presented by supply and waste disposal. Many of the panel members were experienced in management of both supply and wastewater systems. At times, the panel split into two groups - once by primary interest in water supply versus wastewater treatment and once by interest in sampling and stratification versus design of questionnaires. The latter focused on the issues of which performance indicators are important.

The panel consisted of a county administrator, several engineers and economists, five individuals who run and administer water and wastewater programs, three regional commission staff members, several regional or community assistance people, the President of the National Association of Towns and Townships, and a FmHA representative. There appeared to be a nice blend of national, state and local interest in the group, with individuals who understood local operations and data collection problems and individuals with a background of research who had studied the variance of systems and their associated costs over different geographical and institutional environments.

The panel discussion focused on the following topics:

1) Performance indicators
2) Facility indicators (components of systems)
3) Sampling plans
4) Field techniques
5) Analysis plan
6) Federal regulations
7) Priorities within water and wastewater systems
8) Priorities among facilities
9) Secondary data sources and usage

PERFORMANCE AND FACILITY CRITERIA

The program on Wednesday began with agreement to deal with the important characteristics of service, admitting trouble in sorting out what a characteristic was in terms of performance criteria versus performance indicator. The hypothetical town notion was scrapped in large part because most felt that the hypothetical towns were complicated but also already well served with water and wastewater service. Instead, a general listing of criteria was produced in a brainstorming session of the system operators, and this was compared with the submitted papers. On Wednesday afternoon, two small groups were created, one to deal with water and one wastewater in terms of putting together the Abt papers and the general brainstorming results.

Page 34 blank

The task statement for the two groups was:

Define the complete set of characteristics of water (wastewater) service which are provided or should be provided. Consider social structural elements as well as physical and economic ones.

Water Supply

The water supply group derived the following characteristics:

1) Quantity
   - governed by need - economic factors determine amounts that are desired and can be supplied
   - minimum quantities depend on whether the community attempts to provide:
     - no storage lifeline
     - 2 day storage
     - industrial and residential over/peak/storage
     - development and growth of community

2) Quality
   - governed by regulations and designed to promote health and aesthetics

3) Operations of maintenance
   - guarantee uninterrupted service
   - risk reduction from interconnection of two or more systems but otherwise no interconnection is recommended
   - conservation - mandatory monitoring is recommended, depending in small part on costs
   - accessibility - total community service is recommended, regardless of resident income

4) Service level decisions must focus on:
   - central management monitoring
   - enforcement
   - collective vs. individual systems

Wastewater

1) Facility needs are dependent on:
   - health
   - ecological factors - fishable/swimmable
   - development factors
   - regulations

2) Land usage important in determining types

3) Density important in determining types

4) Soils important in determining types

5) Costs important in determining types

6) Indicators of quality:
   - coliform bacteria

- eutrofication
- nitrates
- phosphates
- proximity to water supply

Sources of Information for Both Water and Wastewater

1) County health departments

2) State health departments

3) County sanitarian

SAMPLING DESIGN AND SURVEY INSTRUMENT

On Thursday morning the panel had a general conversation about services in the morning and then moved to two groups in the afternoon. One was given the task of suggesting a sampling design and stratification procedure for the entire study, and the other dealt with the question of an instrument and methodology of gathering data on-site.

Sampling Design

1) Problem of open space

2) Clustering - CED's in proportion to population in ED

3) Variability should be sufficient across clusters but narrow within clusters

4) Divide states by economic regions - hierarchy of cities analysis

5) Stratification by income/income spread

6) Gross groundwater districts are a possible cluster

7) SCS work on water subregions is important

8) Race, ethnicity, Indian reservations should be considered

9) Flood plains and terrain should be considered

Questions About Quality

1) Source
   - what is the source?
   - what are the characteristics specific to drinking water standards?
   - constant quality?
   - type of treatment required?

2) Treatment
   - is treatment provided?
   - what type of treatment is provided?
   - is quality consistent and operation adequate?
   - do you have to boil water?

3) Transmission
   - determine water tightness - quantity loss/contaminants
   - nature and frequency of leaks
   - routine maintenance and nature
   - type of pipe and age
   - what is incidence of pollution infiltration?

Questions About Quantity

1) Source
   - has there been a water shortage?
   - what is source?
   - usable storage in reservoir
   - what is yield of source?
   - what is yield of well into aquifer?
   - what is usage

2) Treatment
   - what is the capacity of treatment plant?
   - what are the capacities of components of treatment?
   - plants/design (rated) capacity
   - what is the treatment process?
   - what is the adequacy of treatment process to deal with variability?
   - is treatment plant adequate to usage?

3) Storage
   - what is the water source?
   - capacity of water source
   - capacity of transmission line
   - what type of storage?
   - what type of capacity?
   - where located - relative to potential housing/industrial site?

4) Distribution
   - map showing layout of system
   - looped, grid, dead end
   - length and size of pipe
   - number of fire hydrants
   - maximum/minimum pressure - what flow conditions?
   - appertances/booster station/pumping
   - pressure reducing, flow regulating
   - valves on system - capacity

5) Service level
   - what is level of service - individual/cluster system
   - mix of use - industrial/commercial interruptions of service

SUMMARY CONCERNS

Note: All concerns were listed; it is likely that not all panelists would agree with the full list.

1) How do you find "knowledgeable" people? Within a community, who has valid and reliable information?
2) How do you cover all viewpoints and how do you avoid the danger of finding one person who either "knows it all" or thinks he or she does? How do you verify information received?
3) Who is going to do what with the data of the study? The perennial question of evaluation. There does not seem to be much specification about what anyone is prepared to do with the information in this case. Does this mean the typical outcome of non-use?
4) Are we adequately treating the non-hardware aspect of capacity? (E.g., we are looking at hospitals, but are we looking at the present or future number of doctors to staff them?)
5) Has the issue of sampling breadth versus depth been looked at fully in terms of tradeoffs? (E.g., What is the value and the cost of spending more time in less places?)
6) A critical question is how to focus on places without formal facilities for water, waste water, etc. There is an inherent bias looking at what is inadequate about existing systems. The bigger problem is the more undifferentiated "mass" of spaces in which there are few if any existing facilities under inventory.
7) How do you correlate the facilities with other data (e.g., above poverty, illiteracy, etc.) that also relate to primary need? In other words, is there a broader calculus of need within which facilities should be only a part?
8) How to define the smallest end of the "place" continuum? The present strategy of treating all unnamed places as an indifferentiated area of open space contains many problems. One is that without knowing the number of "cross-roads" communities, there is no good way to stratify the sample down to tiny social units, which in so many ways are different from open spaces.
9) Is the issue of equity adequately considered in terms of access in use of resources not so much at a national level (e.g., what kinds of communities have systems and which don't), but within communities (e.g., the extent to which all people are equitably treated within the system's theoretical service area).
10) Is there sufficient concern for over-capacity? (e.g., the current emphasis is now almost exclusively on minimums in the study). The relationship of sizing and over capacity to growth (e.g., using the slack in existing infrastructure) may be inadequately considered.
11) Is there concern enough with relationship of standards to service, and how to deal with standards as constraints. (FmHA is providing services not standards).
12) Is there a danger that the study will rely upon and tend to further sanctify existing "high retail" cost levels for rural water and wastewater systems? Where do the cost estimates come from? To the extent that they come from "rip-off" firms which use the same design to apply to many communities, there is certainly a problem here.

13) Are cost saving strategies such as self-help adequately considered. In that sense, is development in a physical realm adequately linked to social and human development that involves participation not only in planning but in actual implementation.
14) The question of how to continue the data base is critical. Is it being given adequate attention? That is, identifying the resources or so constructing the information such that it might readily allow for local, regional and state mechanisms for a continuing updating.
15) How do you trade off the need for comparable data and national standards with regional variability not only in what constitutes acceptable need response (e.g., quantity of water available) but variability in tolerance and incidence of risk (e.g., of flowing in inadequate storm drains).
16) Are we adequately considering the relationship of community development to economic development?
17) How do we consider that the presence of a facility may actually hurt rather than help service. There is a large central recreation building named after Richard Nixon in Hyden, Kentucky which has actually diverted resources from a decentralized approach (e.g., book-mobiles and getting services out into the hollows where people live and from which they simply will not come to use the central building). It is a question of use of indicators, also of understanding where the correspondence or fit between facility and program break down.
18) In setting priorities for which facility areas to look at, there is a clear need to differentiate between which areas are most important (e.g., education) and those in which there is an especially close correspondence between the availability of facility and performance (e.g., not educational!).
19) The tradeoffs between utilizing existing data sources and gaining more uniform comparability through primary data collection needs to be understood in a number of different contexts. One is whether even with primary data, this study can go beyond a national inventory (e.g., to reliable information on a state basis). I doubt it. Given the sampling technique and size envisioned. Another is whether the study or its commissioner could have any leverage through this exercise in dealing with the horrendous problems of incompatibility of data collection efforts past and present-- and probably future.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

1) How are the panel members feeling about their contribution to the task at hand?

Without exception the members indicated that they were "feeling" good about their contribution. There was a uniform sense that the presence of the Abt recorder as a person who would directly take output and do something with it made the sense of participation very real.

2) What have been your most serious frustrations?

There was less sentiment voiced on this question. Three or four persons noted that they were frustrated by a lack of definition of what was to happen in this study, not so much in terms of its content, as its process and its approach. Two people voiced a different frustration -- that the range of different backgrounds in the group sometimes made it difficult to communicate. But when asked if they would lessen the range for next time, they indicated that they would not and that it simply was a frustration as we proceeded but a useful one.

Another person indicated that the group's size was a frustration and that it was too large to allow for complete interchange in the sense of a team at all times. Still another person noted the floating in and out of observers was difficult. (There was unanimous consent to that point! But it was not generally considered a "frustration".)

3) What is the group feeling most positive about?

Three thoughts were voiced. (1) We are feeling positive about the fact that we at least think we were helpful. (2) The group seemed to effectively integrate researchers and practitioners. (3) While we were one group and probably should not judge our performance in terms of other groups, the sense gathered from some of the other groups of a lack of productivity couldn't help but make us feel better.

When I asked why the group felt that their effort might have been more satisfying to members than those of some other groups, the general response was the presence of the Abt recorders, the ability to set aside polemics and "policy" considerations in favor of doing a systematic job of analyzing data needs, and the particular "mix" of this group.

4) How has the conference helped you as individuals?

The major thought voiced was that it has been enriching for people to learn from each other--especially researchers from practitioners and vice versa in a way that they would not normally interact. The difficulty of the problem of inventorying facilities was also noted as one general learning. People felt that they would tend to be less critical of Farmers Home Administration and other groups in the future for not having a complete data base now that this program had indicated that even in as straightforward an area as water and wastewater just how difficult it was to define criteria and indicators let alone to go out and do the counting.

5) Has this process been worthwhile and if so how should it be continued?

It was a general sense that the process had been worthwhile and that it should be continued but that the mechanism for doing so for this group should be left up to the Abt recorder.

ENERGY PANEL REPORT

Summary

Significant revisions were made to the initial approach by AAI. A broader-based program for energy facility assessment was devised. The small group process worked well with key input being made by all participants.

Discussion

Initial Premise - The "going-in" position of AAI, as represented in both the performance and facility criteria documents, was that Community-Owned Energy Facilities were limited to REC's and Municipals distributing electricity or natural gas. Although this assumption had never been explored with FmHA, it seemed to be consistent with the terminology of the facilities list and of pertinent FmHA (and REA) action. The initial observation of the Panel held that this definition was much too limited and that the Panel should expand its scope to alternative energy supplies, to program and policy options, and to a broader address of the "rural energy issue."

Panel Dialogue - The first day was spent developing the concept of the "rural energy issue." I believe that the detailed discussions are relevant only where they lead to conclusions. These conclusions were:

1. The current status of generation and distribution facilities is generally adequate. Nearly everyone who wants electric service has it. Nearly everyone for whom gas service is practical has it. Future needs for electric facilities will likely be met as they have in the past - with the exception that REC's are more and more getting into generation. It is unlikely that natural gas service will be expanded.

2. The extremely long lead times for energy related facilities requires that this issue be given a very long planning horizon.

3. As a facility, "Energy" cuts across all other program areas. Thus, we could not consider energy per se, but had to address energy uses, energy needs, and energy supply options, always in the context of "for what" and "where".

4. The availability of alternative energy technology and non-facility (or policy) options became major considerations in structuring a rural energy facility assessment.

Page 42 · blank

5. The scope of the Panel must be expanded to consider energy needs fulfillment beyond traditional centralized facilities and must include program and policy options as well. This latter becomes more important as one considers the large energy use impacts which could arise through mandates in, say, the FmHA Housing, Transportation, or B and I loan programs.

Program Recommendations - Some energy is used in the course of supplying some other services, a facility assessment program has to consider these uses and the alternative means available to meet the energy requirements of each. To accomplish this, the following program features were recommended:

1. A complete literature review should be conducted covering energy assessments of a similar nature. This is not to be a review of secondary data. Rather, a review of other studies, where results or methods are relevant, is called for.

2. Energy use and needs should be addressed for each of several sectors and for each of several need areas in each sector. Exhibit 1 illustrates the cells which were developed. Within each cell, the points shown in Exhibit 2 should be developed. (During the course of the second day, the Panel took a pass at highlighting these points for four representative cells.)

3. The analyses of needs and solutions in each cell should be based upon a bracketing, rather than seeking a definitive, quantitative answer. The bracketing should consider two scenarios:

- Business as usual

- Alternative and dispersed technologies

4. Relevant data for development of the needs portion of the scenarios can be taken from sources such as are shown in Exhibit 3. It was felt that there need not be a broad primary field data exercise.

5. Whether or not current and future energy needs are adequately being met are to be assessed using the criteria highlighted as Exhibit 4.

6. Facility needs for the future can take several forms, including:

- Central facilities
- Community-based, dispersed facilities (such as cooperative fuel storage facilities, solar or wind energy conversion, methane conversion, cogeneration, etc.).

- Local, or on-the-farm facilities (such as solar grain driers, methane conversion facilities, wind devices, etc.).
- Program directions in other FmHA areas which, through conservation, obviate the need for additional energy facilities.
- Education and Technical Assistance programs to encourage and enable low cost, local facilities to be identified and built, at the lowest cost to the resident.

7. The Priorities and Community Typologies suggested by the Panel for use in this study are shown in Exhibits 5 and 6, respectively.

Process Observations - I believe that the small group process worked quite well in this case. Panelists worked together and the conclusions presented above represent the verbal consensus. There was no minority report.

The panelists split quickly into two loosely defined groups. The first represented the operation of REC's and Municipal's. The second represented the alternative technologists. The philosophical and practical differences in the approach taken should be obvious. The differences were not destructive and, in fact, contributed greatly to a fuller discussion. There is no obvious point of view which should have been represented on the Panel and was not.

We did not use the Case Studies. Regarding them, one Panelist noted that each described a community of 7000 and that this was "large." Along the same line, the FmHA definition of a rural community for the purpose of this study gave the Panelists some problems.

Having a fulltime, knowledgeable note-taker is vital. There is no way the Facilitator could do that in addition to facilitating.

All Panel members expressed interest in continued participation. They should be used individually when the need arises for specific information and as a group when the need arises for review of the program and of results.

Exhibit 1.

ENERGY USE MATRIX

	Agriculture	Industry and Defense	Residential and Commercial	Institutional
Space Heat			x *	x
Space Cooling			x	x
Process Heat	x *	x		
Process Cooling	x	x		
Hot Water			x	x
Motive Power	x *	x		
Lighting			x	x
Mechanical Power	x	x		x *

x - Of greater importance
* - Reviewed during Panel meeting.

Exhibit 2.

POINTS FOR ENERGY CELL ANALYSIS

1. How are needs being met currently.
2. What are the constraints on continuation of current means into future.
3. What alternatives are available to ease constraints.
4. What means are available to address issues posed by constraints and alternatives.
5. How do we obtain data on the un-met need.
6. How do we obtain data on the facility implication of this un-met need.

Exhibit 3.

DATA SOURCES IDENTIFIED

REA - Power Requirements Studies

National Rural Cooperative Finance Corporation

American Institute of Cooperatives

Co-op Banks (several)

Association of Agricultural Cooperatives

National Rural Electrical Cooperative Association

Argonne National Laboratory (Ref: John Roberts)

American Public Power Association

DOE - Wholesale Power Marketing Agencies

State Cooperative Associations

Exhibit 4

CRITERIA FOR ENERGY SUPPLY ADEQUACY

- Reliability
- Availability
- Cost consistent with other regional suppliers
- Cost such that budget for energy is not way out of balance
- Social acceptability
- Long term viability and price stability

Exhibit 5.

SUGGESTED PRIORITIES FOR ANALYSIS

Level	Energy Use Related to:
High	- Food production - Health - Residential
Medium	- Industrial - Commercial
Low	- Transportation* - Education - Safety

*There was a discussion but no resolution regarding whether Transportation should have a higher priority.

Exhibit 6.

SUGGESTED COMMUNITY TYPOLOGIES

By Activity

Farm and/or ranch service center

Agricultural

Bedroom

Extractive industries
   Forestry
   Mining
   Energy
   Resource
   Fishing

Tourism - Recreation

Retirement

New commercial-industrial center

Old commercial-industrial center

Institutional center

Exhibit 6.

Suggested Community Typologies - Continued

Other

- Growth - Stable - Decline
- Population settlement pattern
- Geography (resources, climate, terrain, public land)
- Traditional energy use patterns
- Age and type of housing stock

TELECOMMUNICATIONS PANEL REPORT

SUMMARY

The telecommunications panel produced the following:

(1) A list of questions necessary to elicit an adequate description of the telecommunications facilities in any given community;

(2) Charts displaying (a) telecommunications alternative to more traditional facility designs and (b) some typical telecommun ications devices and uses and the type of system (e.g., telephone, cable...) required to employ them;

(3) A priority ranking of the services which telecommunications systems provide;

(4) Descriptions of the minimal system requirements necessary to deliver the priority services;

(5) "A Message to Washington" from each individual panel member;

(6) Primary and secondary data services and estimates of their reliability (given directly to the Abt representative and not contained in this report).

FACILITATOR'S INTRODUCTION

Any telecommunications panel which purports to present a comprehensive assessment of telecommunications capabilities and requirements will be composed of people with sharply varying backgrounds. First, there are the telephone people as opposed to the television/radio people. Second, there are those whose major interests lie in the provision of the carrier as opposed to those whose interests are in the provision of the service. And overlapping those divisions are the public as opposed to the private sector representatives. This variety of representation always leads to lively panel discussions, and it has been the experience of this facilitator, at any rate, that it almost inevitably leads to sharply divided conclusions. Surprisingly, this particular panel did not significantly differ on conclusions, despite the fact that it contained all of the elements that usually lead to a fracas.

That is not to say that all of the conclusions were unanimous. Particularly in describing minimal system requirements (Section G) any given panelist would probably come up with somewhat different designs than the ones presented below. The conclusions were, however, ones that we could all live with in harmony if not devotion. That is, they were the products of consensus rather than unanimity.

Because telecommunications necessarily requires some definitions as a necessary component of discussion, in order that the interested lay reader not be totally mystified. The succeeding sections will contain products #1 through #5 (numbers from the summary). These will be the products as agreed upon by the panel. Facilitator's comments are clearly designated as such.

Page 50 - blank

DEFINITIONS

Narrowband systems, such as radio and most telephone systems, have a capacity below that necessary to transmit full motion video.

Broadband systems, such as broadcast and cable television have the capacity to carry at least one full motion video signal.

Point-to-point fixed path systems, possible with both narrowband and broadband capacity, are "dedicated lines" directly connecting specified users.

Point-to-point switched systems, such as the telephone, create and discontinue a path between two or more users on demand.

One-to-many systems, such as the broadcast media and the most common uses of cable TV, send signals from a central point to those in the covered area who have the necessary receiving equipment.

Many-to-one systems, such as "upstream" services offered by some cable TV systems, send signals from many points in the area covered to a central point.

A cable system is a "tree and branch" configuration in which all points are connected to a central point. It is not normally a switched system, as defined above, although manual switching equipment may be (and often has been) added for special purposes such as teleconferencing among a few (not many) locations.

QUESTIONS NECESSARY TO ELICIT AN ADEQUATE DESCRIPTION OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES IN ANY GIVEN COMMUNITY

Facilitator's comments: The panel distinguished among the conventional "bread and butter" systems, such as plain old telephone service (POTS) and normal TV (either over-the-air or cable)/radio, and the less familiar systems (e.g., microwave or two-way cable). The latter "exotic" uses and systems, will be covered in the next section. Some systems, such as telegraph, were not considered at all. Implicitly (but not explicitly), the unconsidered systems were deemed unimportant to the survey. Some of the questions were expanded and refined when the requirements of priority systems were discussed.

POINT-TO-POINT COMMUNICATIONS: POTS & 2-WAY RADIO

1. Questions relating to type of system

   a. Scope: who can be reached without a toll call?
   b. Access: who can get to it?

      (1) Grade of service (number of parties) available
      (2) Number and types of people and areas excluded
      (3) Quality of service: reliability

   c. What equipment and services are available?
   d. What is (are) the medium (media) of transmission?

2. Questions relating to financing

   a. Is the telephone system cost oriented or average cost?
   b. What is the corporate structure (e.g., Bell, cooperative, large/small, independent)?
   c. What is the source and cost of funds (e.g., subsidized, loan, internally generated)?
   d. What is the price of base service?
   e. What is the cost of base service?

3. Questions relating to expansion plans

   a. What new services to present customers are planned (include time frame)?
   b. What new people and areas will be included in service area (include time frame)?

4. What emergency services are available?

   a. 911?
   b. Emergency medical?
   c. Emergency fire?
   d. Emergency police?

5. Questions relating to present customer usage

   a. What is the emergency usage compared to other uses?
   b. What is local-call usage compared to long distance?
   c. What is total usage?

MASS DISTRIBUTION TELEVISION SYSTEMS: OVER-THE-AIR & CABLE

1. General Questions

    a. Can residents receive signals?

        (1) Can residents receive commercial stations?
        (2) Can residents receive public and/or educational stations?

    b. What is (are) the transmission medium (media)?
    c. How many channels are received (by anyone)?
    d. Where does the transmission (program) originate?
    e. What is the quality of signal (measured by satisfaction)?
    f. What is the quality of programming (includes amount, e.g., # of channels; and variety, e.g., sports, news, general entertainment, children's ...)?
    g. What are the constraints to broadcast/reception?

        a. Terrain
        b. Regulation
        c. Ordinance
        d. Local economic conditions
        e. Subscriber/consumer density
        f. Logistics
        g. Signal interference

    h. How are signals imported (medium - media)?
    i. Who is viewing what?
    j. How many unused frequencies are available?

2. Questions relating specifically to cable

    a. Who owns the system (local or distant)?
    b. What is the quality of facilities?

        (1) Age of plant
        (2) Quality and schedule of maintenance

    c. How many channels?
    d. Who is excluded/included in cable path? Where is the cable path?
    e. What is cable penetration (what percent of homes along path subscribe to service)?
    f. What are installation charges?
    g. What are subscription charges?
    h. What and how many special-service channels are available (e.g., public access, education...)? What is amount and variety of use?
    i. What are the characteristics of subscribers (e.g., educational level, economic level, race...)?

MASS DISTRIBUTION RADIO SYSTEMS: OVER-THE-AIR RADIO

1. Can residents receive signals?

   (a) Commercial stations?
   (b) Public and/or educational stations?

2. How many stations can be received?

3. Where does the transmission (program) originate?

4. What is the quality of programming (includes amount, e.g., # of stations; and variety, e.g., sports, news, general entertainment, children's...)?

5. What are the constraints to broadcast/reception?

   a. Terrain
   b. Regulation
   c. Local economic conditions
   d. Logistics
   e. Consumer density
   f. Signal interference

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AS ALTERNATIVES TO CONVENTIONAL FACILITIES

Facilitator's Comments: Communications systems often are supports for other community facilities. Without knowing the nature of other available facilities, it is impossible to assess whether a communications "shortfall" exists. In addition, communications facilities can often serve as partial or complete alternatives to other traditional facilities. As reflected in the priority rankings (shown in Section F below), the panel strongly felt that appropriate alternatives to traditional facility design should be considered whenever cost effective and particularly when (current or expected) staffing difficulties limit the usefulness of traditional facilities.

In order to illustrate the "alternative" aspects of telecommunications systems, the panel considered each of the other facility categories to be assessed by Abt. The members then filled in two charts. The first charts shows examples of the use of telecommunications systems as partial or complete replacements for other facilities. The second chart indicates typical devices (e.g., electronic blackboards) and the type of system required for their use. That is, the first chart indicates what can be done; the second chart shows some of the ways to do it. Neither chart has yet been reviewed by panelists and corrections may be necessary.

CHART I: Telecommunications as an Alternative to Delivering Basic Services Through Traditional Facilities

FACILITY SUBSTITUTED FOR	COMPLETE REPLACEMENT	PARTIAL REPLACEMENT	EXAMPLE
A. HEALTH			
Physician staffed outpatient clinic	Paraprofessional staffed outpatient clinic with telelink to physician support		Dartmouth Medical School; Block Island, R.I.; Playas Lake, N.M.
Emergency centers	Same as above		Speculative
Mental Health Clinic	Remote psychiatrist, group sessions		St. Charles, La. evaluation unknown
Nursing homes, clinics, disabled homes...		Remote EKG's, blood pressure	Elkhart, Kansas (phone in distant med. center with person's name & age; send EKG from person over phone line, results come in hard copy at local point).
In-service training	For paraprofessionals		Appalachian Ed. Satellite Program
B. SAFETY & JUSTICE (also civil)			
Station and/or court equipment		Fingerprint transmission Transmission of documents	Philadelphia Philadelphia

FACILITY SUBSTITUTED FOR	COMPLETE REPLACEMENT	PARTIAL REPLACEMENT	EXAMPLE
Emergency Communications Equipment		Cable transmission	Tocom Green Thumb Philadelphia Bemidji Mt., VA
In-service training facilities	Firefighters Police Prison personnel		App. Ed. Satellite Rockford, Ill. Philadelphia Stillwater, Mont.
C. WATER SUPPLY D. WASTE WATER		Remote switch controls	Elkhart, KS (over fulltime circuit from 1 or more locations to a control point at any distance, valves can be opened & closed, tanks changed,etc.)
E. EDUCATION			
Day-care center		"Expert" sharing. Professional back-up to care givers	Speculative Spartanburg, S.C.
Traditional Academic Primary, secondary		Teacher sharing	Irvine, CA., Reading, PA, Alaska (satellite)
		College/high school class sharing	Kutztown, Pa. - results unknown Ed. Telecomm. - Alaska
Higher	Student at home Student in remote classroom		Corvallis, Ore.; Spartanburg, S.C., Appalachian Satellite Program.,U. of Wisc. Extension; U. of Ill., Spartanburg, S.C.

FACILITY SUBSTITUTED FOR	COMPLETE REPLACEMENT	PARTIAL REPLACEMENT	EXAMPLE
Vocational	Student on job receiving remote-originated courses		U. of Minn., TCU; Stanford U. Speculative for secondary education
Community colleges	Student at home Student in remote classrooms		Spartanburg, S.C. Columbus No. Virginia Comm. Col. Appalachian Educ'nl Satellite Program
Home or "residence" bound disabled facilities	"Mainstreaming" requirements		Amherst, NY Columbus, Ohio
General consumer ed./information			U. of KY (Lexington) NYC; everywhere.
Inservice training facilities	Professionals & paraprofessionals at home or remote classrooms		
Primary & secondary			Appalachian Ed. Satellite Program; Danville, Ill.
Sheltered workshop			Speculative
G. ENERGY		Load-leveling	Trials now underway by Pacific Bell and Mountain Bell.
H. RECREATION			
Congregate centers		Fun and games	Columbus, Ohio
Inservice training	Paraprofessionals at home or remote		Apallachian Educ. Satellite Program

CHART II: Typical Devices and Type of System Required (Facilitator's note: everything which can be carried on a narrowband system can also be carried on broadband; the reverse is not the case)

SYSTEM REQUIRED	TYPICAL DEVICES
Cable T.V. or Microwave Systems (broadband capacity); many-to-one capability	Some surveillance systems; teleconferencing; full full motion video responses from remote students to tv teacher (technologically cumbersome); response from remote students to tv teacher; voice responses from remote students to tv teacher (open circuit permits separated students to hear one another); some alarm systems; Pay tv; polling devices (technologically simple).
Upgraded telephone systems	Picturephone
Telephone systems (narrowband capacity)	Electronic blackboard (requires tv receiver); Electrowriter (requires projection screen); Educational telephone networks; EKG reading; dial access inquiry and still video response (teletext); computer information retrieval or interactive processing (alphanumeric input/alphanumeric or graphic output); electronic fund transfer; document facsimile transfer; slow scan; computer-aided instruction; load-shedding; remote control devices; voice teleconferencing; many alarm systems. Read-outs for the deaf.
Radio	FM subchannel with SCA receiver in home for the blind

PRIORITY RANKING OF SERVICES WHICH TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS PROVIDE

Priority 1: Communication to protect life and safety and preserve property.

Subpriority a: Emergency one-to-many systems (example: broadcast)
Subpriority b: Back-up system to (a).
Subpriority c: Adequate point-to-point telecommunications service at reasonable rates to the widest practicable number of subscribers.

Priority 2: Communication necessary to support the normal day-to-day activities of the community including public and economic affairs and social support.

Priority 3: Alternative service delivery systems and devices where cost-effective and consistent with FmHA's overall priorities (refer to section E).

Priority 4: Provision of entertainment -- the expenditure of public funds is not recommended for this service.

Facilitator's Comments: The panel reached its priority ranking by asking the question, "If money were available to do only a limited number of things, what things should be done first?" There was no disagreement among the panelists that, as far as an individual location was concerned, the priorities should be as noted above. If the money were to come from a federal source, however, no consensus was reached as to whether loans and grants should be considered on a case-by-case priority basis or whether across-location priorities should be considered. For example, if Community A, which has satisfied its life-preserving communications requirements, applies for a loan to support day-to-day requirements at the same time that Community B applies for a loan to finance a life-preserving communications system, should Community B's request be given priority? The ambiguity of the "priority ranking" did not appear until near the end of the conference when the panel was polled for "Messages to Washington" (see Section H). By then, time for discussion had run out and the issue remained unresolved.

MINIMAL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS NECESSARY TO DELIVER PRIORITY SERVICES

Priority 1:

Subpriority a: Area coverage of signals transmitted; adequate relays when necessary for reception.
Subpriority b: Back-up generating equipment
Subpriority c: (See same subpriority in Section F). One party telephone service to facilities and providers (includes broadcast stations, hospitals, police and fire stations, individual physicians, etc.); one-party service available throughout system; at least four-party service provided throughout

subpriority c: system; when phone not practicable throughout system
(cont'd) (due to terrain or distance), the ability of provider to receive emergency signals from C.B.s when terrain permits, two-way radio if terrain is a barrier.

Priority 2:

A. All of the elements listed under Priority 1.
B. The ability to transmit at least one "regional" tv or radio station ("regional" = a multi-county area encompassing a community-of-interest) with adequate relays for area coverage.
C. Actual delivery of information with local content
D. Area coverage by at least 1 national tv network.

Priority 3:

Facilitator's Comments: This is an expansion and refinement of the recommended questions contained in Section D. Survey of existing communications capabilities so that cost-effectiveness trade-offs can be made.

1. Is there broadband capability
    a. Coverage?
    b. Cable, microwave, fibreoptics?
    c. Capacity for two-way?
    d. Satellite reception?
    e. Teleconferencing capability?
    f. Translators?
    g. Arial or buried cable?
2. Telephone
    a. Coverage?
    b. Digital service (now or near-term in expansion plans)?
3. Two-way audio other than phone?

Priority 4:

Area coverage by at least 1 commercial and 1 public television station. Facilitator's Comment: It was the sense of the panel that this priority should be addressed by removing inhibiting regulation. It was not considered an appropriate priority for public funding).

MESSAGES TO WASHINGTON

Facilitator's Comments: In the time remaining at the end of the conference, the panel was polled in order to permit each panelist the opportunity to send one policy message to Washington. For the most part, these messages appeared to reflect the consensus of the panel. In a few cases, however, the messages revealed some unresolved issues. These will be noted in the list below.

1. "Area coverage" refers to the presence of signals. Federal money should not be spent for receiving equipment for individuals. (Facilitator's comment: Special-case receiving equipment (e.g., SCA's for the blind) was not considered and no inferences regarding such expenditures of public funds should be made).

2. Federal subsidies should be strongly linked to local willingness to cost-share and local control of the facility.

3. Priorities should be ranked on local performance (if a community has Priority 1 capability, it should not be automatically excluded from Priority 2 loans and grants until all Priority 1 requests are satisfied. (Facilitator's comment: This remained an unresolved issue. See Facilitator's comments in Section F above and "messages" 4 and 9 below).

4. Set a deadline for loan and grant requests rather than first-come-first serve so that priority requests can be compared. A contingency fund should be set aside for quick-action emergencies.

5. The Federal government should support telecommunications for public service (e.g., protect spectrum and transponder space).

6. The FCC is the greatest obstacle to the appropriate use of telecommunications in rural areas.

7. Communications should be retained as a separate funding category. (Facilitator's comment: Lack of discussion time left this as an unresolved issue. It was unclear whether the message-sender meant that communications should only be funded under its separate mandate or whether, for instance, a health telelink could be supported by a health facilities loan or grant. If the former, it is possible that some of the panelists would disagree).

8. The FmHA program should not be limited to facilities but should include related services. (Facilitator's comment: The consensus on this message was not clear).

9. Priorities should be ranked across locations (Facilitator's comment: See Message 3, above).

10. The Feds should quit wasting money on duplicative funding programs and general silliness. (Facilitator's comment: There was no consensus that this survey fell into the category of "general silliness").

JUSTICE PANEL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The justice panel was comprised of an excellent mix of resource people who not only represented a broad rural perspective, but also the major areas of law enforcement, courts, and corrections. After spending most of the first morning attempting to clarify expectations and the role of conferees, the group worked to identify a typology of services that might be appropriate to rural areas. Ranking the importance of those services was thought to be an impossible task, and the group decided to move immediately to facilities and generated a list of facility needs. Finally, these needs were evaluated in light of existing data sources that describe the status of facilities in rural areas.

The general climate of the group was a combination of high task orientation in which the various content resources of the group were used in a fairly balanced manner. The group developed a respect for one another as resources fairly early in the process. Strong feelings were expressed regarding 1) ambiguity of expectations, 2) the inadequacy of pre-conference work, and 3) some suspicion that Farmer's Home was using conferees to build a case for increasing their appropriations. These issues were discussed fairly openly and the summary that was given by Bill Huff to the final plenary session reviews those concerns. On the other hand, most group members wanted to be kept informed and in several cases offered to be involved in follow-up activities.

SUMMARY

The following summary of the Justice panel output is arranged in order of five major questions.

I. Identify what services should be provided to rural areas and their important aspects.

This question was conceptualized using a matrix that not only broke out functional areas of justice, but special justice areas that demand special services and facilities.

Functional Areas	Adult Civil & Criminal	Juvenile	Special*
Law Enforcement Functions			
Ajudicatory Functions			
Correctional/Rehabilitational Functions			

* Special refers to mental health, drug, and alcoholism

This model was used as a framework to determine the various spheres of justice services. As a result the group felt that Law Enforcement, Adjudicatory, Correctional, and Juvenile services were worthy of specific attention. Juvenile was considered as a special issue that cuts across the other three functional areas because it seems to be receiving a great deal of attention at the present time. The group generated the following list of essential services under these four major areas.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. DIRECT SERVICES

Public Order:

- maintain smooth & safe flow of traffic
- provide control of large crowds

Enforcement:

- maintain traffic flow and arrest (ticket, warn) offenders
- arrest suspects when sufficient evidence is available

Prevention:

- general area patrol to establish visibility in the community
- provide crime prevention education to citizens
- selective enforcement activities to warn of problem situations

Investigation:

- investigate crimes when called to the scene
- protect crime scene
- investigate traffic accidents

Community Assistance & Social Service:

- provide medical/emergency assistance in cases of accidents or injury
- transport intoxicated persons to detoxification facilities
- transport mentally ill persons to appropriate facility
- provide physical assistance to citizens
- handling animal problems
- missing person problems
- provide public information to citizens
- handling domestic/family problems

Civil Functions:

- serving papers/warrants
- tax collection
- vehicle registration
- gun registration
- license investigation

2. SUPPORT SERVICES

Communications:

- citizen complaint evaluation (gather information)
- communication to remote data facility (NCIC)
- interagency communications (e.g., to fire station)
- dispatch communications to officers in the field
- information relay to internal police units

Investigation:

- activities: ballistics, fingerprints, photography, talking with witnesses
- crime lab facilities
- evidence protection

Administration:

- maintain personnel records
- payroll activities
- internal investigations
- vehicle maintenance
- planning & research
- reference library

Records:

maintain records

- criminal history
- warnings - warrants
- stolen property, autos
- license & registration
- dispatch records

Reports:

maintain reports

- stolen property
- missing persons reports
- contact reports
- arrest reports
- complaint reports

Training:

- basic
- in-service

Transport/protect prisoners:

B. COURTS (Adjudication)

MAJOR FUNCTION	IMPLIED FUNCTIONS
Pretrial	- arraignment* - interviewing - investigation - bonding* - prisoner release (ROR) - hearing motions formal seeing hearing securing

B. COURTS (Adjudication) - Continued

MAJOR FUNCTION	IMPLIED FUNCTIONS
Prosecution	- research - presentation to Grand Jury* - managing caseload - interogating* - case preparation investigation
Defense	- legal research - research - presentation - investigation
Trial	- deliberation - *seeing hearing securing - presentation* recording - jury selection - legal research - holding
Record Keeping	- Civil Record storage - docketing - filing - storing & preserving recording - *evidence - movement record circulation
Post trial	- pre-sentencing (investigation) - sentencing* - hearing post trial* appeals
Post Sentence	SUPERVISION INTERVIEW

C. CORRECTIONS

DETENTION FACILITY

1. Intake
   Sally Port, Gun Lock, Booking, Photo & I.D., Search, Pre-Booking holding (Bonding)

2. Property Storage Areas

3. Adult holding Area
   Separate Male & Female

4. Detox/Medical Area (Special holding), Medical and Housing

5. Administrative/Support
   Dispatch, Security Control, Records, Arrangement

6. Food Preparation & Storage

7. Multipurpose Area
   Exercise, Library, Recreation, and Program

8. Laundry Area

9. Visitation Area (Contact & Non-Contact)

10. Additional Considerations.
    Security Area Communications (Interaction)
    Air Cond/Smoke Ventilation
    Auxiliary Power
    Emergency Evacuation

D. JUVENILES

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION & LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. General Prevention

   a. Job counselling, training, and placement

      - Recreation programs
      - Counselling & resource federal (school & family related)
      - Diversion Programs
        - status offenders
        - short term counselling & resource referral
        - mental health counselling & evaluation
      - Separate Detention of Offenders

b. Abused/Neglected Children

- Health care
- Family counselling & resource referral
- Foster homes/group homes/shelter care
- Diversion programs

2. Adjudication

- Pre-hearing separate detention where appropriate
- Pre-hearing alternatives to detention where appropriate
- Investigation and Report
- Orderly administration of juvenile proceedings
- Evaluation
- Referral to treatment programs

3. Disposition

- probation services
- counseling services
- alternatives to detention
  - group homes
  - treatment
- separate detention where appropriate
- after-care

II. Identify ways to measure most important characteristics.

After consulting with an Abt representative, and explaining the difficulty of prioritizing services that are an integral part of a "justice system," the group decided not to prioritize services and moved directly to facilities.

III. Identify the most important aspects of facilities needed to provide service.

IV. Identify ways to measure important facility characteristics.

The facility questions follow directly from services provided. Our group chose to identify facility needs, and in some cases check lists, as they relate to the four functional areas.

A. Law Enforcement: The Law Enforcement group identified a need to look at services/facilities that were provided locally and those that were provided from outside the local area. The following general model is a way of conceptualizing this issue of where to look for service provision and points out those elements that should be considered when gathering field data.

FOR EACH FACILITY:

Is Facility Available in Area?

If No: ______________________________ Where in an Outside Area is Facility Available

Facility	Producer	Facility	Location	Access

With this model in mind, the following facilities/equipment needs were enumerated:

Facilities and Equipment

A. Law Enforcement

Stationhouse

Communications

- telephone equipment
- radio/dispatch equipment
- terminal link-up with
- state national data sources
- recording systems
- portable radios (in carrepeaters)
- channel scanners
- CB receivers
- public contacts points

Detention: (up to 72 hours)

- holding cell
- lavatory
- bunk/bedding
- food provision
- closed circuit TV (observation)

Crime Prevention: (Training)

- projectors, films - audio-visual materials

Motor Vehicles:

- type of vehicle
- vehicle equipment
    - radio
    - light bars
    - radar
    - first-aid emergency
    - gun locks
    - front/back seat divisions
    - fire extinguisher
- four-wheel drive
- special vehicles
    - boats & equipment
    - snowmobiles
- mobile command vehicles

Traffic

- radar equipment
- breath analyzer

Substation facilities:

- space
- communications (phone) radio
- desk, file, typewriter, etc.

Investigation:

- camera
- crime lab facilities
- forensic scientific equipment kits
- evidence storage facilities
- interrogation space

Officer equipment:

- uniforms
- handcuffs
- weapons
- badges
- body protection

Community Service Assistance:

- transport vehicle
- emergency lighting equipment

Station Equipment:

- riot control equipment
- tear gas

o bomb control

- detection equipment
- scuba equipment

Administration:

- office equipment
- vehicle maintenance (private/public)

B. COURTS

The courts group listed the facility needs in relation to the list of services we have generated earlier (underlined items are facility needs):

MAJOR FUNCTION	IMPLIED FUNCTIONS
Pretrial + = secure circulation	
[ ] = might be off-site	- arraignment*
hearing room	- interviewing
conference room	- investigation
semi private office	- bonding*
[medical & psych. facility]	- prisoner release (ROR)
sec't. office space	- hearing motions
record storage	formal* seeing
	hearing
	securing

MAJOR FUNCTIONS	IMPLIED FUNCTIONS
Prosecution	
law library hearing room sound protected conference room evidence storage room record storage sec't space wit/waiting s prisoner holding	- research - presentation to Grand Jury* - managing caseload - interogating* - case preparation investigation
Defense	
law library hearing room priv. offices record stor. sec't support	- legal research - research - presentation* - investigation
Trial	
jury rooms law library *"court room(s)" law clerk off. chambers priv. off sec/recep. prisoner holding witness waiting att. conf. room evidence stor/ court reporters bailiff	- deliberation - * seeing hearing securing - presentation* recording - jury selection - holding
Record Keeping	
intake & recpt'n vault-2-hr. rating two types: civil & criminal cabinets etc. file area & copy room data systems space work space	- Civil Record storage - docketing - filing - storing & preserving recording - * evidence - movement record ciruculation

MAJOR FUNCTIONS	IMPLIED FUNCTIONS
Post Trial	
interphase w/ • pretrial needs • clerk (recordkeeping) • trial	- pre sentencing (investigation) - sentencing - hearing post trial * (appeals)
POST SENTENCE Interview Private off. Seminar rooms Record storage	SUPERVISION INTERVIEW

Major issues that effect Court facilities are the life safety code, security needs, the nature of the technology, and circulation needs.

C. CORRECTIONS

The corrections facility list provided an index of what might be expected in a detention (72 hour) facility and a longer term facility. The following were seen as important to the survey and can be used as a check list:

Functional space	Holding 72 hrs.	Detention 1 yr.
Cell Area		
• single person cells (should not exceed rated occupancy for more than 24 hours)	X	X
• state certified code compliance	X	X
• individual sanitary fixture	X	X
• table unit		X
• natural light	X	X
• forced air-vent. system	X	X
• secure building systems	X	X
• connected dayroom space		X
• segregation by sex	X	X
• 24 personnel M/F	X	X
• shower	X	X

Functional space	Holding 72 hrs.	Detention 1 yr.
Security		
• Central security station (Dispatch)		X
• Auxiliary Power	X	X
• Communications-security	X	X
• SallyPort		X
• Gun lock	X	X
• Booking Room (area)	X	X
• Photo/ID Area		X
• Separate search area	X	X
• Pre-booking holding		X
• Telephone Area (prisoner)	X	X
Visitation Area		
• Attorney Area	X	X
• Contact		X
• Non-Contact		X
Special Areas		
• Special holding cell		X
• Detox Area	X	X
• Medical Exam Room		X
• Medical Housing		X

D. JUVENILE

Community Center (Youth & Family)

- multi-purpose facility (gym)
- kitchen & dining
- administration space
- counseling space (including secured recordkeeping-equip)
- infant child care space

Community Shelter Care Facilities (Abused Children here or hospital)

- Community based residential dwelling
- Max. of __?__ youth
- Co-ed home
- Administration space
- At least one counseling area

County/City Jail Juvenile Holding Area (Smaller Community - 72 hrs.)

- secured space separate from adults
- minimum 2 rooms + 1 private bath (toilet)(per secured unit)
- max __?__ residents per unit (no overcrowding)

Juvenile Intake-Detention Facility (Short term 72 hrs. - Larger Community

- secured
- multi-purpose room
- personal property storage
- intake counseling room (interview)
- isolation room
- dormatory (2 per room + private toilet)
- __?__ max residents

V. To Set Overall Research Priorities

The following table reviews the research priorities from the standpoint of existing secondary data and the difficulty in collecting the data.

Research Priority	Data Sets Desired	Existing Info	Difficulty of Collection	Comment
Law Enf. good data on personal & budget but not on facilities	Communications holding facilities motor vehicles traffic consubstation investigation equip. officer equip. station equip.	FBI stat.'s worthless; Lack of comprehensive nitty-gritty info on Local facilities makes it hard to pull out rural picture	Facilities that serve local area vs. facilities outside area that provide local service -- question of what to count	How fa do you go?
Courts could do & survey by states	Rooms Room use Conditions Appropriateness to Activity access security building systems	Substantial amount of work has been done question of how it relates to rural-there are a number of state inventories	Difficulty gathering data on J.P., municipal, & small claims courts, etc.	Relati of service & facili is difficult

Research Priority	Data Sets Desired	Existing Info	Difficulty of Collection	Comments
Corrections Local-Correction	Cell area security visitation special	There is considerable data available - see reference list.		Won't be able to gather what community wants??
Juvenile Justice	Community Ctrs. Shelters Holding Area Detention	high need	will be difficult due to variation and newness - statutes are clear in some cases.	Census data on community revenue data

Secondary sources were identified by the group as being fairly extensive in all areas except juvenile justice. Martin Leitner took extensive bibliographic notes on existing secondary resources which will be added to the final report.

VI. Overall Concerns and Reactions

The summary of the whole group's evaluation is one source for reviewing the overriding concerns of the group as is the second enclosure of Bill Huff's final summary.

MESSAGE TO ABT AND FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

First we would like to commend the Farmers Home Administration and the consultant, Abt Associates, on the recognition of the need for the facility inventory and the methodology used in this conference. Too many times a bureaucrat or a social scientist will determine a level of need which misses the actual needs of a local community or the decision maker will determine a service level and its facility component without recognizing the major differences between urban and rural communities. We commend you for the approach used in this conference.

We would like to thank the National Rural Center for the very good organization of this conference and their staff support during the conference.

On the subject of our committee, Justice Systems, we did not set priorities between the different functional categories of Law Enforcement, Detention, Judicial Systems and Juvenile Justice. The committee feels that the four areas are inter-related as spokes on the same wheel and that the system cannot effectively operate without each function. We do know that each local community has weak functional areas in the justice system and we feel that the priorities should be set in each local area according to that jurisdiction's weakest functional area.

The committee has some objective concerns to address to Abt Associates which we would like to share:

- Abt did not adequately prepare for this conference. We feel that more preparation should be made before convening other meetings of this type.
- We would point out that an assessment of future trends in facility needs are different than a designation of a minimum standard for rural areas. The minimum standard which we determine today may not be tomorrow's minimum Further, the minimum standard may be changed by forces over which rural communities have minimal influence. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of detention facilities. The minimum standard for detention is set by case law and has changed drastically during the past four years.
- We are concerned about the end product of this study. If you must be selective as to the facility areas to be studies, give FmHA a clear, sharp picture of the needs in some facility areas even at the expense of not studying other functional areas.
- Please do an evaluation from the standpoint of needs in the rural areas rather than FmHA's present areas of funding concentration. The need for all manner of capital improvements are great and many local areas have greater needs for which funding is not now available than those communities have need of water and sewer services.
- We suggest that an opportunity for this type of conference or input from the conferees at two additional points during the study:

  At the point of design of the questionaire, and
  Near the end of the evaluation phase.

This committee wants further input into the study.

We would like to address some objective concerns to the Farmers Home Administration:

- We would like to be kept informed of FmHA's progress in the Rural Development area.
- As to governmental reorganization, whatever the end product, rural people and their governmental structures need an identified federal agency or sub-agency separate and distinct from th urban oriented agency to represent the rural interests of the United States. Urban oriented programs simply do not work well in rural areas.
- Do not depend on a national minimum standard for every part of every facility for design criteria loans to local agencies. Half a loaf is better than none if the community cannot afford the full loaf.
- Lastly, in some facility projects, an increase in grant monies are required, rather than loan monies, because of the high cost of the minimum facility. Let me caution you to be careful in this aspect of federal funding. One hundred per cent grant monies are totally ineffective in facility funding. If the local people do not help to pay for the facility, then the facility will not accomplish its purpose in the local community.

SUMMARY OF THE WHOLE GROUP'S EVALUATION

1. How are the panel members feeling about their contribution to the task at hand?
   - Feeling of being used - FmHA knows where it wants to go and is using us to legitimate them
   - Felt that given the time, lack of definition of what was wanted, that we did fairly well in addressing the objectives.
2. What have been your most serious frustrations?

   (Frustration related to purpose of study - heard different measures)

   - Frustrated with the quality of the precarfeirius work that was done - insulting to conferees.
   - Major concern that FmHA uses research data to make a case for federal appropriations, but not to set minimum standards on local communities.

3. What is the group feeling most positive about?

   - Give credit to **FmHA** for sensing a rural need and asking for advice from practitioners, etc.

   - Liked other people in group, learned from them, impressed with diversity and quality of people.

   - Generally liked the overall conference approach -- small groups as consultants with output given to contractor.

4. How has the conference helped you as individuals?

   - Developed gov't contacts, learned personally.

   - Will gain more if summary reports from each group are shared with participants.

5. Has this process been worthwhile and, if so, how should it be continued?

   - Absolutely - strong consensus for ongoing relationship to the project - might keep group informed with progress reports and solicit feedback - would especially like input into final design and also a reaction to the final product.

HEALTH PANEL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The health panel represented a broad spectrum of the rural health community, and worked well together as a group. Some issues sparked heated debate, but the group had mutual respect for each other and was able to reach agreement on most points.

Health was a particularly difficult area to tackle. The basic problem was that the approach of the study makes little sense in the health field. A community needs assessment in health should first answer the questions "what services are needed or what are the service gaps?" Facilities are a secondary issue.

The group tried, at times with great difficulty, to reconcile this problem with the task at hand. Rather than use the hypothetical communities or the papers as guides, the group chose to start from scratch. The final recommendations for the study represent a consensus of the group.

However, while the group responded to their task and provided recommendations for the study, participants felt very strongly that their policy recommendations were as important, and maybe more so, than the study recommendations. At times, there was even an air of "we'll make recommendations for the study because we recognize the study will proceed with or without our input, but the policy issues are what is really important." In fact, the better part of two days was spent on policy, as opposed to study recommendations. The group felt that its combined expertise should be utilized to improve the operation of the community facility loan program.

The group also fully expects to be kept informed of the study's progress and most stand ready to be of assistance to Abt and Farmers Home in the conduct of the study.

GUIDANCE REGARDING THE STUDY

General Statements of Concern

1. Assessing need in the health care field should begin with service not facility needs. Facility requirements will be an outgrowth of service needs. Examining health care needs through facilities is an artificial, backwards and unreliable way of determining true need of health care.

2. Services can, and should, be provided in a variety of different kinds of facilities and organizational settings. The group stressed the need for flexibility in funding and felt strongly that the study should not reinforce the present rigid definitions for facility funding.

3. Throughout the two and a half days, the group continually returned to the importance of examining demand as well as need. Just because a service or facility is available or in an expert's eyes is "needed" does not mean people will utilize the service. Hence, any assessment of shortfall must include an assessment of demand. The group also was concerned about how the study would assess "need". Different people have different perceptions of need.

4. The group expects to be kept informed and consulted with at every step of the assessment.

General Study Design Recommendations

1. The group strongly opposed any attempt to set national guidelines or measurements of need (or national priorities for that matter) in the health care area. Instead, the group favored relying on the "standards" and assessments of shortfall developed by the health systems agencies (HSAs) and the state health planning and development agencies (SHPDAs). By law, these planning agencies are mandated to determine need and plan for the gamut of health services. Rural areas are very diverse and definitions and standards of need vary across the country. The group felt these differences should be recognized.

The general feeling was that as inconsistent and in some cases inadequate as the data is, Abt can do no better in the short time available for the study. After considerable debate, the group approved, by a vote of 10-2, the following:

   a. data collected in this survey will be rough approximations of community needs
   b. to get good data would require a survey beyond the resources of the study.

2. The group spent a long time discussing methods and potential problems with sampling techniques. After clarification by the Abt researchers regarding how the sample will be drawn, the group made the following statements:

   a. Medical trade patterns and service areas for each facility must be studied separately. These areas may have no relation to a particular "community".
   b. All efforts must be made to ensure that geographical areas within state receive equal attention in the survey.

Facilities to be Included in the Study

Because the needs in health stem from services, it is often difficult to categorize by facility. However, the group felt the following facilities should be examined:

1. primary care (could include hospital out-patient department or independent clinic, as well as private doctors' office)

2. hospitals (secondary care)
3. emergency medical services (includes emergency medical facilities -- which could be other than a hospital, i.e., ambulances or a communications system)
4. long term care facilities
   Note: The group felt strongly that LTC must be viewed broadly. Sheltered living facilities, home health services and day care facilities must be considered along with skilled and intermediate care nursing facilities. More on this in the policy report.
5. dental facilities (could be freestanding or within a primary care clinic, should also include flouridators)
   Note: Demand is particularly important for dental services. Any assessment of need must include an examination of demand.

Data Collection

The group felt that the health portion of the survey should rely on secondary data sources. For each facility type, data sources are indicated in the order they should be examined. If the first does not provide sufficient data, move on to the second, and so on.

1. Primary Care

   Data sources

   1. State Health Plans (SHPs)
   2. Health Systems Plans (HSPs)
   3. Health Systems Agencies (HSAs) -- including governing boards and staff
   4. regional commissions (i.e., ARC, Coastal Plains, Ozarks, etc.)
   5. individual clinics (for renovation and modernization needs)
   6. state medicare/medicaid surveyors (for out-patient departments)
   7. state and national federations of clinics (such as the Rio Grande Federation of Health Centers in San Antonio, California Rural Health Federation in Fresno, the National Association of Community Health Centers in Washington and their regional affiliates, the National Rural Primary Care Association in Waterville, Maine)

2. Hospitals

   Data sources

   1. SHPs
   2. HSPs
   3. HSAs
   4. individual hospital plans (for modernization and renovation needs, these plans are usually reviewed by the HSAs)
   5. state medicare and medicaid surveyors (will know conditions of hospitals)

      Note: The surveyors must be contacted as a secondary data source.

6. state medical facilities plans
7. state hospital associations

Caveats/Concerns

In areas of small population, the use of bed-to-population ratios to determine service need is inadequate. State and national ratios are developed for political and economic rationales.

3. Emergency Medical Services

Data sources

1. State EMS plans (state department of EMS)
2. regional (sub-state) EMS plans
3. HSPs
4. Hospital Association surveys

Caveats/Concerns

1. The data will be uneven, and most rural (or less dense) areas tend to be ignored.
2. Classification schemes differ and are biased against remote places.

4. Long Term Care

Data sources

1. SHPs
2. HSPs
3. HSAs
4. state medicaid/medicare surveyors
5. HUD/State Office on Aging, Area Agencies on Aging (for residential facilities)
6. State surveyor -- for home health agencies

Caveats/Concerns

1. The data will not quantify the need for sheltered housing, a prime concern of the group.
2. Existence of a home health agency in a county does not necessarily mean the needs of a particular community within a county are being met.

5. Dental Care

Data sources

1. SHPs
2. HSPs
3. HSAs
4. state dental societies
5. state health departments (for flouridation needs) also education departments may have information regarding whether or not school systems have flouridated water).

Caveat/Concerns

1. The need/demand factor should be fully explored. The difference between need and demand is especially critical for dental services.
2. Flouridation:
   a. the data for rural areas may be weak.
   b. the lack of flouridation may have been a conscious community decision and therefore would not reflect a need.

POLICY ISSUES

Funding Priorities

The group felt strongly that national priorities for facility funding are inappropriate. While as a nation, we may recognize the need for more primary care, many communities may have a more pressing and legitimate need for a hospital, long term care facility or emergency center. Hence, the group felt again that states should set state priorities according to the needs and priorities outlined in the state health plans and health systems plans.

The group did endorse one general priority. Projects which fulfill more than one facility need should recieve priority. For example, water/sewer project whish is also necessary for the community's health or an elderly sheltered housing facility which is both a health long-term care and a housing facility should receive priority.

The group also provided direction for priority setting within each facility type. In other words, when a state FmHA office has 50 applications for primary care facilities, what criteria should be used to prioritize the projects for funding?

Very generally, the kinds of issues which need to be examined before funding a facility include the following. The importance of each will vary across facility types and communities.

1. utilization (services received)
2. need
3. demand
4. availability/accessibility
5. acceptability
6. staffing (number and characteristics)
7. range of services (is it appropriate and adequate)
8. alternatives
9. accountability
10. administrative/management linkages
11. financial status
12. feasibility/stability (short and long term)
13. efficiency
14. effectiveness
15. quality of care
16. population served

More specific considerations for each facility area were outlined. The group's intent was to provide guidance, not to mandate unreasonable requirements. Hence, many criteria use the words "encourage" and "appropriate". Implicit in these criteria is that FmHA should not support projects which over or under serve a community.

For all facilities, FmHA must require that projects show compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations.

Primary Care Facilities*

1. appropriate referral arrangements to secondary care
2. part of a comprehensive system of care
3. adequate demand
4. evidence of community support
5. 24 hour coverage
6. staffing potential (recruitment and retention)
7. must accept Medicare and Medicaid

Note: This issue generated heated debate but was finally approved by a vote of 12-3. A minority in the group felt that because Medicare and Medicaid payments in rural areas are so inadequate, providers should not be penalized for not accepting payment. The majority supported the view that as a federal loan program FmHA has the responsibility to support programs which will be open to the entire community.

* The group debated how to handle mental health services. Because of the complexity of the issue, limited time, and the feeling that mental care should be part of a primary health care system, the group decided to include mental services within the primary care facility area.

Hospitals

1. potential for adequate staffing
2. encourage adequate programs for continuing education of staff
3. appropriate range of services provided
4. where appropriate, multi-service facilities should be encouraged including for example medical, primary/care, primary dental care, long term care, day care, home health services, mental health, other community uses.
5. encourage sharing where possible (is likely to be inappropriate for more isolated hospitals)
6. encourage appropriate referral arrangements

Emergency Medical Facilities (could include an emergency facility -- not necessarily a hospital, ambulance or radio communication)

1. personnel
    a. adequate qualifications (training)
        emergency rooms should be staffed with registered nurses (RNs)

ambulances should be staffed with emergency medical technicians (EMTs)

2. training (provisions for continuing education for staff)
3. part of a comprehensive system, evidence of appropriate referral arrangements)
4. adequate communications
5. equipment appropriate to level of service
6. evidence of a public education program (the service is useless if the community is unaware of its existence)

Long Term Care

Note: The group spent considerable time debating long term care. There was general agreement that long term care funding priorities should include: home health, sheltered living and day care. The controversy centered around whether or not FmHA should fund intermediate and skilled nursing care facilities (ICFs and SNFs). Some in the group felt that ICFs and SNFs were in critically short supply in many rural areas and should not be excluded. Others felt that as a limited loan program, FmHA should fund innovative projects which keep people out of the expensive traditional institutional system and which fall between the cracks of other funding sources. While we never voted on whether to include ICFs and SNFs in our list, we implicitly gave them a low priority in agreeing to the following statements.

1. activities which keep people out of the institutional system should be encouraged
2. priority should be given to those programs which are expanding equipment and facilities to provide greater home health and residential care.

The group also felt strongly that flexibility of funding in this area is particularly important since long term care can and should be provided in many different settings.

Primary Dental Care (could include equipment, water flouridators or facilities)

1. adequate demand must exist (Demand for dental services is particularly important in dental care. Need is not sufficient to predict utilization.)
2. staffing potential

SAFETY PANEL REPORT

Introduction

The safety panel was composed of practitioners and researchers with considerable expertise in the fields of fire services and emergency medical services. The panel experienced considerable frustration over the lack of clarity as to whether the survey would be attempting to measure performance criteria of services in rural areas or only capital facilities. Those concerned with fire felt the pre-conference materials were inconsistent with the assignment given to them during the conference (i.e., to focus solely on facilities). Further, there was nearly complete agreement that the mandated FmHA policy decision to focus on facilities was an error with respect to fire, though probably alright for emergency medical services. While information on fire facilities is necessary, the nature of the fire problem indicates (in the opinion of the panel) that the greatest impact and needs are in non-facility aspects of fire service.

Several group members felt strongly that data on facilities alone may be almost useless in describing the "needs" with respect to fire problems, and the shortfall in expenditures required to reduce fire problems. The group consensus was that it would be extremely difficult to assess the relative needs of individual communities if data were only collected on the level of capital facilities in each community without concurrent data on the outputs of the service in question. The panel felt that fire losses could be best minimized by increased expenditures on fire prevention, education, training and planning efforts.

Despite these serious concerns, the group has outlined the facilities which should be considered and on which data should be examined - within the FmHA constraints. Most doubted that this information will provide any useful insights about corresponding data on the incidence of fire and the shortfalls in terms of fire prevention programs, planning, organization, communications, training, and fixed fire protection systems. In addition, the panel provided advice on emergency medical services and listed caveats and concerns about the study.

Fire Facilities - What Can FmHA Count?

1) Fire Stations
  - -number of garages within certain response time
  - -radius of structural properties (measured in time)
  - -radius of acres of wildlands
  - -radius of value of wildlands
  - -number of pieces of apparatus
  - -radius of value of structures
  - -radius of people protected

Page 86 - blank

2) Water in hydrant system (same considerations as in #1)

3) Water - open (year round availability)
  -tank capacity
  -number of tankers
  -capacity per pumper

4) Apparatus (relate to #1)
  -type of apparatus
  -number of units in compliance with NFPA 1901

5) Communications
  -alarm system (24 hour capability)
  -personnel alert (24 hour capacity, numbers alerted)
  -percentage of personnel in 24 hour alert
  -percentage of personnel within timed first alert
  -interdepartment available (number of staff/apparatus within reach of fire alert)
  -interdepartment communication line (truck to station, truck to truck, man to man)

6) Facilities
  -automatic suppression/detection equipment
  -% of strucures with detection equipment (occupied/not occupied, residential/commercial, remote monitored or not)
  -% of structures with suppression devices (occupied/not occupied, residential/commercial)

7) Training facilities
  -access to adequate classroom facilities
  -access to adequate outdoor facility for hose/ladder/pumper evolutions

8) Community Public Fire Education
  -Have/have not (other than fire prevention week)

9) Determination of fire cause
  -percentage of incidents reported
  -type of reporting system

10) Fire mapping
  -rural road and structure numbering and marking (for dispatch purposes)

Fire Sources of Data

Data Sources	Type of Data
NFPA Annual Survey	Property loss Injuries Deaths Number of fires Population protected

Data Sources	Type of Data
	Number of stations Number of engines
U.S. Forest Service	Wildlife hazards
State Data	9 states have national incidence reporting system Fire Marshall at the State level Per capita rates are unknown Property loss - is not associated
Federal/State Health Depts.	Burn injury data Burn death data
National Burn Information Service	Critical burns only

Emergency Medical Services

For years, two federal agencies, DOT and HEW have been heavily involved in Emergency Medical Services as a national effort.

EMS, as a system, is highly developed from a standpoint of role definition and evaluation criteria.

It is recognized that there are 15 components of an EMS system. For the purpose of this study only one of the components should be addressed, which is an unfortunate and narrow-minded approach.

1) Ambulance service
   - ambulances able to reach 95% of the population in 30 minutes
   - % of non-EMT personnel, EMT-basic personnel, and EMT paramedic personnel
   - minimum of two personnel responding on vehicle
   - secondary ambulance transportation arranged for
   - number of total ambulance calls and number of emergency calls
   - total number of personnel (paid vs. volunteer)
   - vehicles housed in safe, environmentally sound, controlled facility
   - public education - citizen intervention programs for health
   - continuing medical education programs

2) Ambulance vehicle - equipment
   - % of American College of Surgeons minimum equipment list equipped vehicles
   - % of vehicles meeting Federal design criteria, KKK-A-1822A
   - does the service provide extrication services? do these meet DOT standards for light-duty resucue under Standard 11?
   - % of drivers with formal emergency vehicle driving training

3) Communications
  - % of ambulances with 2-way communication to hospital
  - % of advanced life support ambulances with bio-medical telemetry
  - communications with M.D.?
  - 24-hour dispatch communications for personnel and vehicles
  - single access emergency number
  - % with radio communication to other public safety agencies

Emergency Medical Services Data Sources

Bob Motley
Enforcement and Emergency Services
N.H.T.S.A. - U.S. DOT
Washington, D.C.

David Boyd, M.D.
Division of Emergency Medical Services
H.E.W.
Hyattsville, MD

The E.M.S. Director in each state

Study Caveats and Concerns

The safety panel individually listed concerns and responded to evaluation questions. In general, the group expressed frustration about trying to work non-facility concerns into a facility study. The group was concerned that the study by identifying facility needs might lead to an infusion of capital dollars into rural America for fire facilities when facilities are only a small part of the rural fire protection delivery system (perhaps insignificant part in many localities). However, the group stressed that the rural fire problem was severe and better information is needed.

The group agreed that any infusion of Federal funding should be directed at:

1) Loss of life
2) Loss of property
3) Number of injuries
4) Reduced area burned
5) Reduction in number of fires

In addition, the group agreed that Abt should stratify the size of communities sampled for the fire aspect of the study. The group was more interested in the status of fire protection or facilities in communities of 10,000 or less. Another general comment by the group was the appreciation of sharing expertise with others knowledgable in the fields of fire protection and emergency medical services.

Some of the individual comments made by group members include:

1) The main item of concern was pointed toward the concrete goal of our input - will the input be used to advance prehospital care in rural America?

2) I have some hope of another agency adding further funds for EMS.

3) There is a narrow definition of service delivery options of interest; failure to recognize the possible mixes of high and low technology answers possible in fire protection; concerned that the inability to answer the "right way" will lead to ignoring the services nature of the fire problem.

4) I feel my contribution to the panel has been of some assistance in the technical areas of EMS, and of only moral support to the broader area of fire service.

5) My frustration at this meeting was temporary, but stemmed from a lack of information by the consulting firm as to what our role was, and also frustration in trying to channel my thoughts on what a total EMS sysem is down to only the component of facilities.

6) I think the group feels good about having some input, although narrow, into a rural facilities assessment.

7) The conference has helped me understand the Farmers Home Administration - their limitations and goals.

8) Rural areas and small communities have a serious fire problem but also have a larger amount of apparatus and equipment than larger communities.

9) Any effort to increase our data base and reduce our fire problem is worthwhile.

HOUSING PANEL REPORT

Introduction

The housing panel was composed of three state officials, three areawide planners, a researcher, a city manager, a developer of Indian housing, a developer of housing for farmworkers and low-income persons, and several federal officials.

The panel felt the papers sent to them were limited in approach and did not deal with them. Rural multifamily housing cannot be addressed without looking at single family housing and the role of the private sector in housing development. In assessing shortfall, the panel concluded that Abt should look at population characteristics as well as housing stock which will need replacement or improvement in the coming years.

The panel recommended that Abt involve persons with broader backgrounds in rural housing and mentioned Don Harwinge for the University of Iowa and George Rucker of Rural America, Inc. as two valuable resource persons. In addition, the panel felt it important to explore the possibilities of insuring that the 1985 Census provides better data.

The following report was drafted and approved by the participants at the conference. It is organized around the following topics:

- Recommended methodology
- Variables to be included
- Probable situations to be encountered
- Future participation and conference evaluation

RECOMMENDED METHODOLOGY

Definitions

Rural area should include as a primary target, those incorporated areas of under 2500 population.

Rural housing should include entire rural housing stock, not just traditional multi-family housing.

Sample

Sample should be stratified by category of community as follows:

1. No government structure in the community.

2. Municipality.

3. Intermediate government structure (parish, county or township.)

Page 92- blank

Data collection

Ask key informants their perceptions of housing needs. Surveyor should also make personal inspection of housing needs to provide additional information.

Suggested data sources

Annual Housing Survey

Regional housing censuses
County and/or state public health officials
Local housing authorities (HAP)
Local postal authorities (vacant houses)
Councils of Governments
State planning offices
Community Action Programs
Departments of Social Services
HUD Area offices (area economist)
County health nurse; county health department
Cooperative Extension Service
Local FmHA office - county supervisor
State & regional housing authorities
Non-profit housing developers, private developers in housing market sometimes have housing surveys.
Bureau of Indian Affairs
HUD 701 housing elements
HOP's
School district censuses
Chambers of Commerce
Law Enforcement Assistant Administration
Economic Development District reports
Veterans Administration
Most reliable county employees (county clerk, county agent)

VARIABLES TO BE INCLUDED

Characteristics of housing

1. Sanitary facilities

   Hot & cold running water inside dwelling unit
   working toilet inside dwelling unit
   working shower or bath inside dwelling unit

2. Food preparation and refuse disposal

   Kitchen that includes refrigerator, stove & sink

3. Space & security

   No more than two people per bedroom

4. Thermal environment

   Appropriate and safe heating system

5. Illumination and electricity

   Dwelling unit has safe electrical system

6. Structure and materials

   Reasonable protection from the elements

7. Access

   Safe access and egress.

8. Site location

   Appropriate - free of excessive noise, pollution
   Proximity to employment

Characteristics of population

1. Age of family head
2. Income
3. Family size
4. Occupation
5. % of low-moderate income households paying more than 25% of income for rent
6. Race or ethnic characteristics
7. Total population

NOTE: This list is not necessarily in a form in which data can easily be collected and compiled, but represents the concepts that should be considered. We recommend that secondary data be confirmed by spot checks in specific areas. Specific criteria should reflect regional differences.

Capacity of local area to support housing programs

Questions dealing with local capacity to:

1. Plan for housing
2. Provide direct housing services
3. Provide related housing services (referral, outreach, counselling)

These questions should be asked of key informants as appropriate (e.g., FmHA supervisors, state, sub-state, regional and/or local officials):

Capacity for housing planning

1. Is there any housing planning going on?
2. Is the locality 701 certified?
3. Is the locality covered by a HAP or HOP?
4. Is there a Section 111-funded housing planning effort going on?
5. Is the locality part of a sub-state regional planning agency?

Capacity for providing housing services

1. Is conventional mortgage money available?
2. How many 502, 504 and 515 rural rental housing loans are outstanding?
3. Percent of 502 loans that have interest credit?
4. Is there a profit or non-profit package for 502, 504 or 515 loans?
5. Is there a self-help housing program?
6. Are there builders/developers willing to do 502/504 construction?
7. Is there a DOE or CSA weatherization program going on?
8. Is there a rural housing repair program?
9. Is there a Section 8 program going on in the area?
10. What is the average time it takes to process 502, 504 and 515/Section 8 or SIS/RHAP loans?
11. What is the local political climate for multi-family or assisted housing in general?
12. Is the area served by a local housing authority or local housing assistance corporation.

Capacity for providing related housing services

1. Is housing counselling being provided? (Pre-occupancy and/or post-occupancy)

2. Is this HUD-approved counselling?

3. Are there any active tenants rights organizations?

4. How many hours per week is the county FmHA supervisor available in his office?

PROBABLE SITUATIONS TO BE ENCOUNTERED

1. Most information will be subjective

2. Certain community/municipalities will not have professional staff of any type

3. Expect a very conservative and anti-governmental attitude response

4. Surveyors appearance, language, behavior will be very important

5. Timing appointments and identity-relationship of interviewer to interviewee must be considered

6. Maps/adequacy of transportation, weather, time of year, i.e. farmers/planting time

7. Correlation of new primary data, to secondary data

Feasibility vs. Need

It is the considered opinion of this panel that the optimum survey recommended by this Panel may not be feasible within the scope and budget of this study. However, for the area of priority suggested by the panel, unincorporated places under 2500 population, there is no identifiable data upon which to plan programs. Additionally, that area contains a growing portion of FmHA's consitituency.

FUTURE PARTICIPATION AND CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Review of Abt's actual design before the instrument is put into effect. Notice should be given to the Panel if any of its recommendations are rejected.

Review of material after it has been gathered and interpreted (draft of final report).

Run results of Panel's peer group for USDA research (review data before its disseminated).

FmHA should review any special Census that will be performed and that will provide answers to what this group has focused on.

Evaluation Questions

1. How are the panel members feeling about their contribution to the task at hand?

   We are satisfied as a group for making individual contributions. However, we cannot evaluate our group's contribution or progress until it has been determined what use, if any, will be made of our contributions.

   Feel we've come to a point where Abt should have been before we got to the conference.

   Our feelings on the contributions are contingent upon Abt's acceptance.

   Bias that runs against consulting firms - FmHA should expand and do their own work in the area Keep on top of Abt and FmHA to produce.

2. What have been your most serious frustrations?

   - Trying to figure out where Abt wants to go with this.
   - Abt had no one on board who could really answer our questions. If we had someone who thought out what was realistically expected from the group, we could have saved some time.
   - Not sure that we didn't do something that Abt other than what Abt expected.
   - Problem was, we needed someone from Abt at the outset of the meeting.
   - FmHA invited me to the conference; Abt accepted me into the conference; NRC made plans for the conference. Having 3 bosses makes it hard to determine who is accountable; who are we doing work for?

3. What is the group feeling most positive about?

   - FmHA has realized that there is a need to research and develop in rural areas.
   - They are putting money and time into this effort.
   - FmHA has taken initiative to do this and NRC, who put it together, did a good job of getting a diverse group of professionals in each field.

4. How has the conference helped you as individuals?

   - Good fellowship; enjoyed benefit of broadening perspective.
   - Enjoyed interacting between panel members and gaining knowledge from people who are aware of what's going on in other regions.
   - Met interesting people; personally learned something; don't know if it accomplished what Abt wanted.
   - As individuals we were all contributing to the group tasks; we've done some good things; we've made some progress and contributions and we've learned from each other.

5. Has this process been worthwhile, and if so, how should it be continued?

   - I personally have a bias against the conference because participants are expecting easy answers and instead, one will probably leave with a feeling of frustration.
   - Yes, it has been worthwhile.
   - Should be continued as noted in our recommendations.

TRANSPORTATION PANEL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Mutual recognition of the extreme diversity across the nation in needs and demands for transportation of people and goods and of the wide range of appropriate solutions to transportation problems best characterizes the transportation panel's tone. The panel was very practical in describing performance and facility criteria and argued that care must be taken in providing generalized approaches to transportation issues and assessing services because of this diversity.

Diversity in transportation needs, demands, and solutions was thought to arise for several reasons. These reasons, therefore, are parameters which must be involved in the design of any transportation system. Important considerations in demand for services are the economic level of the population, travel patterns of residents, and the purposes for transportation. Some factors affecting the choice of transportation mode include cost and who pays, current access to transportation systems, energy consumption, and fixed facilities currently available. Other elements in creating the transportation system are community size and geographic location.

In addition to the recognition of diversity, two other assumptions were implicit in the panel's discussions. One was that panelists were seeking to suggest ways to improve existing facilities, though they did not always feel facilities needed improvement or funds would best be spent on certain facilities. The other assumption was that funding would eventually be available to improve facilities.

Transportation panelists generally felt that a rural transportation system is essential because it contributes to nearly every other aspect of rural life. Some suggested reasons for improvement of rural transportation systems were community development, better access, parity of opportunity, and insuring an acceptable level of mobility.

A variety of transportation modes were discussed including rural roads, small city streets, rail, rural transit, air, pipelines, and water. General performance characteristics discussed for each mode were frequency, reliability, convenience, safety, cost, speed, comfort, and location.

RAIL

Initial list of general rail facilities

- depot
- land
- track
- bridges
- tunnels
- club car
- safety equipment
- loading facilities
- boxcars and locomotives
- maintenance equipment
- grade crossings
- holding yards
- classification yards
- communications and signaling

Page 100-blank

Performance characteristics and measures for cargo rail

- economy of the service - true cost of providing the service
- reliability - measured by car availability and uniformity of performance
- condition of roadbed - important for speed and safety
- speed of the car in regard to service
- terminal delay of cars - turnaround time
- cargo damage
- labor counsiderations - workday, inadequate salary base, number of workers per train
- accessibility - demand location, captive cargo and weight, reasonably direct route
- intermodal interface - trailers on flat cars, grain elevators
- energy consumption per unit moved relative to alternatives

Cargo rail facilities identified as necessary for measurement and some suggested measures

- safe track - capacity to handle heavy cars
- car supply - number of special cars, tons which can be carried
- efficient yards - number of people per operation, car yard time
- telecommunications equipment - may be as simple as telephones for a single yard
- retention of viable track - line abandonment
- use of joint facilities

Passenger rail was generally felt to be relatively unimportant. The ICC and Public Service Commissions were thought to have data, though the panel felt the data might be too aggregated to be useful.

ROADS

Initial list of motor transportation facilities

- highways
- bridges
- parking
- terminals
- land
- traffic control devices
- safety vehicles
- maintenance vehicles, yards, and materials

Farm-to-market roads performance criteria - particularly dealing with a collection road

- dustless
- maintainability
- economics
- adequate accessibility
- adequate capacity
- all-weather capability
- fatal hazards - accident records

Farm-to-market road facility criteria and some measures

- drainage
- accessibility
- traffic control devices
- alignment - sign distance
- adequate structural design - wheel loads, width, height, magnitude
- signing (information in general)
- cross-sectional geometrics (shoulders, bridge width, lanes, right-of-way width)

traffic count/load
miles in poor condition - or percentage
inventory of conditions for country and subcountry roads
How many bridges are restricted, by what weight limit?
How many bridges are restricted, by what height/width limit?
How many roads are restricted, by what weight limit?
How many roads are restricted, by what height/width limit?
geometric limitations on roads - miles of roads restricted
Does signing meet the MUTCD standards?
How many tort liabilities have been filed?
Adequate mileage?
Can some mileage be eliminated?
What development roads are required?
Do maintenance standards exist for roads?
percent of mileage which is not all-weather

AIR

Initial list of air facilities

airplanes
terminals
ramp space
towers
fuel facilities
lighting
buffer zones
land
access roads
runways/taxiways
maintenance facilities
navigational devices
loading docks
parking lots
rescue equipment
ground structure
ground transportation

Air service (aircraft) performance criteria and facility criteria

on time
delays - traffic, weather, or mechanical (down time); information is available from each airline
labor - number of people, union problems
fuel consumption - fuel loss while waiting to land, difficulty in getting fuel in some places, high cost of fuel in outlying locations
length of trip - importance of any lack in aircraft amenities
conditions of flight for people - oxygen, pressurization, heat and air conditioning
cost of service - taxes and other add-on costs
loss, damage in shipments, baggage
handling handicapped
deregulation

Airport performance and facility criteria

accessibility - service roads and condition, time and distance costs
runway - length, type of aircraft to be served
response time to weather conditions
operational capabilities
condition of facilities - rest rooms, storage and baggage, handicapped

Airport performance and facility criteria (continued)

- community service - air ambulance, conveniences
- navigational aids
- tie downs and storage facilities
- number of corporate planes based there
- facilities in nearby hubs
- security clearance procedures
- scheduled airlines

WATER

Initial list of facilities

- docks
- rescue craft
- weather
- wetlands
- locks and dams
- navigational facilities - buoys, lights
- dredging

Performance criteria

- Uses charge to keep water way open?
- Available for alternative purposes?

PIPELINES

Initial list of facilities

- right of way
- pumping stations
- ditching machines

Facility criteria

- privately owned
- ditching machines
- pumping stations
- rate-making discriminates in favor of pipelines
- right-of-way - eminent domain
- environmental considerations - soil, farm tile, woods, wetlands

RURAL TRANSIT

Performance criteria

- Does it go where they want?
- Does it go when they want?
- Reliability - type of service
- Scheduling?
- Reasonable cost per passenger mile?
- Safety?

Facility criteria

- fuel
- frequency
- driver training
- number of vehicles
- intermodal interface
- garage and maintenances
- percent of time out of service
- transit stops - shelters
- types of vehicles and capacity
- communications system: (a) radio (b) 24 hours? (c) relay lower
- published schedule and information
- convenience: (a) response time (b) route miles (c) distance to stop (d) headways (e) operating concept

POLICY ISSUES

User charge should go where use takes place.
Greater local participation in funding
Less federal regulation of social economics and environmental considerations
Update local legislation
Less shift and shaft - feds involved with funding for a year and then backing out
Less conflict between agencies and federal regulation

DATA SOURCES

1. Aircraft Owners and Pilot Association Airport Directory - yearly
2. Aviation Monitor
3. CAB, FAA, DOT plans
4. Transplan 76 Initial Iowa Transportation Plan, Des Moines, 1976
5. Title V Regional Commissions - studies of air service demand
6. Midstate Airline study of users in Wisconsin and distance traveled
7. Springfield, Illinois study of distance people travel to the airport
8. University of Texas study of airport capacity in Austin and San Antonio
9. Leonard Wheat (Commerce) - Studies of why small towns grow
10. CAB study of community isolation
11. Regional Commission study of acceptable levels of air study, frequency, etc.

Three priority categories for the modes were examined by panelists. These were: need for improved data, need for improved facilities, and need for improved service. Rural roads and small city streets were generally seen as the modes about which least information is available and for which the need for improved facilities and services is greatest. Rural transit and water were other modes for which panelists felt secondary data is not available. Other modes for which improved service was generally seen as important are rail freight, air, and rural transit.

A number of transportation-related policy issues which are not directly related to performance and facility criteria surfaced during the panel discussions. One policy stance is that transportation user charges should be returned for improvements and repairs where the use takes place. Second, panelists were concerned that local governments and organizations become more involved in planning and implementing transportation strategies. This includes greater local funding of transportation. Third, concern over the level of regulation of the social, economic, and environmental aspects of transportation was expressed. Federal regulation was also criticized because of the conflicting regulations issued by a myriad of government agencies. Next, panelists felt federal regulations and programs which shift responsibility for providing certain services to local governments but fail to fund these services are most inappropriate. Finally, the need for local governments to update legislation in order to provide a modern framework for service provision was discussed.

Average Priority Rankings*

	Air	Water	Pipe-line	Rail Freight	Pas-senger	Roads	Streets	Transit
Data	2.9	5.2	3.8	4.5	4.4	5.4	5.5	5.7
Facility Needs	5.1	2.8	2.2	6.1	3.3	7.1	6.5	4.9
Service Needs	5.1	2.2	1.5	6.3	3.2	7.1	5.4	4.9

*Ranked 1-8, where 8 indicates greatest need.

INDUSTRIAL PARKS PANEL REPORT

THE PANEL

Of the six panelists, three were State Development officials, one was an academic researcher and two represented national membership organizations. The primary missing representation was from the local practitioners including county "smokestack chasers" and private rural developers. It would also have been helpful to have an industrial factory design engineer and an industrial realtor. The geographic distribution of panelists was confined to the Mid-Atlantic States. The panel discussion was controlled by the facilitator and Abt representatives so as to be responsive to the particular questions of the surveyors. Although many panelists had concerns as to the overall purpose of the survey, this issue was only briefly discussed due to the time constraint of the meeting.

The discussion centered around the three following questions:

1. Which facilities or sites should be included in the survey?
2. What physical characteristics about each facility or site should be investigated by the survey?
3. What secondary data is already available and who should be contacted within each interview site in order to obtain the most reliable and comprehensive data?

This report of the panel discussion is organized around the above questions.

WHICH FACILITIES OR SITES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY?

This discussion initially included statements of what not to count in the survey. A number of the panelists felt that a self-contained, privately owned factory in the middle of a cornfield should only be included in the data base if it was vacant and could be occupied with minimum investment on the part of the lessee. In other words, the study should be seeking to identify the existing capacity of a community to provide places of work. Some panelists defined existing capacity to mean fully serviced sites or buildings that are ready for immediate sale or lease to private business. Other panelists felt that only 2 or 3 of the following minimum elements need to be satisfied as long as the remaining elements are feasible with quick response (by end of study frame). The minimum elements for considering a site are:

1. Water
2. Access
3. Sewer
4. Topography
5. No legal constraints

It was generally felt that the water and sewer supply could be of residential dimensions, the access by improved road, the topography such that construction could begin with minimum levelling and all possible legal constraints other than industry-specific be overcome. Energy need not be supplied because of the ease with which any power company can deliver those services.

It was suggested that a hierarchy of sites be used in order to include those sites that are planned for development during the near future. In this case, a matrix would be developed with vertical axis listing the minimum elements of a site such as water, sewer, etc., and the horizontal axis listing the various stages of development from planned to ready for occupancy. Because the survey is merely a snapshot of the status of community facilities and will have little or no value to industrial development practitioners, it was generally agreed upon that the development of such a matrix would not be cost effective.

WHAT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS ABOUT EACH FACILITY OR SITE SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED BY THE SURVEY?

The panelists pointed out that the art of surveying industrial sites is certainly not a new one. In fact, almost all states have developed a community profile of one kind or another. In South Carolina, for example, a typical community profile would describe potential sites using 82 data points. The Abt representative stated that he wanted to use the minimum number of descriptions so as to contain the costs of the survey. The panelists suggested that he use the descriptors as previously mentioned, namely; water, sewer, topography, legal, access, and add to that a brief description of existing structures including square footage and general condition. The Abt representative stated that it would be impossible to inventory every vacant building in this manner and suggested placing a 10-20 acre limit on any site inventoried. The panel responded by saying that many places of work in rural America would not be included in the survey if that strategy were used.

WHAT SECONDARY DATA IS ALREADY AVAILABLE AND WHO SHOULD BE CONTACTED WITHIN EACH INTERVIEW SITE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE MOST RELIABLE AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA?

1. State Depts. of Commerce
2. A-95 Clearinghouse
3. Utility Companies
4. American Public Works Assoc.
5. EDDs
6. OEDPs
7. Tax Assessor records
8. EDA approved projects direction
9. Railroad Data
10. Chambers of Commerce

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Midway through the session, the FmHA Project Director expressed his concern for developing national benchmarks against which to measure the inventory of industrial sites in order to come up with an estimate of the shortfall cost. The panelists mentioned on a number of occasions that the only accurate measure of need is linked to the capacity of the labor force. The panelists felt that it was very important to address this question but the Abt representative continually reminded them that they were there to address the supply side of industrial sites rather than the demand side. The frustration of the panelists was apparent in trying to address the question: "If you have no way of defining the demand side of the question, how can you possibly expect any reasonable analysis by simply inventorying the supply side?"

RECREATION PANEL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The panel was composed of three local recreation officials, two state recreation advisory consultants, two researchers, consultants working on the study, an official from the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Services, and two officials from FmHA.

The panel spent some time reviewing the performance criteria papers and discussed rural recreation problems. The group was skeptical of stating what "should" exist in rural areas and dismissed numbers relating to standards in the performance criteria paper. Given the assumption that there should not be standards, the facility criteria paper was not discussed. It was generally felt that a number of inventories have been conducted from which the right questions for this study can be drawn.

It was agreed that rural recreation is generally locally-funded and is associated with local choice based on need and the community's ability to provide programming, operation and maintenance, and leadership to run the facility. It was also suggested that there are a variety of ways to provide recreation services in places that are not normally associated with recreation, such as schools, churches, and community gathering places.

The discussion was organized around the following topics:

- Rural recreation problems
- Programs and activities
- Service and facility characteristics
- Existing secondary data sources
- Methodology
- Sources of assistance to the study
- Priorities for the study
- Conclusions

RURAL RECREATION PROBLEMS

- Population growth - greater demand
- Changing affluence - greater expectations
- Changing age distribution - rural areas are disproportionately young and old and both age groups often require transportation alternatives to the private automobile.
- Economies of scale (the notion of a market area was frequently mentioned, however, density/travel time relationships with various recreational activities were not drawn).

Page 110 -blank

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

There was a general feeling that programs and activities were more critical than facilities and that programs and activities were the logical starting point for the study, since a facility could have multiple purposes. The demand for various activities will differ from region to region (e.g., snow skiing or outdoor swimming) and from community to community based on local choices. It was also brought out that it is difficult to assess the demand for recreational activities because the community may not take advantage of it once it is in place or, on the other hand, demand might be generated with increased exposure to a given activity. A basic assumption was that the general activities taking place twenty years ago have not changed dramatically, and these should be planned for and assessed. Newer, popular activities are often "extras" that the community may wish to provide, but would not be considered critical to the recreation needs of the community.

Distinctions were drawn between indoor and outdoor recreational activities, individual and group/social, self-directed and organized, locally-based and broader market areas.

SERVICE AND FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

There was a general acceptance (though not systematic review) of the indicators mentioned in the performance criteria paper, except that actual numbers regarding what a community "should" have were deleted.

The service characteristics mentioned were as follows:

1. Accessibility - travel time, physical ability to get to the facility, (need to look at user characteristics, and distance).

2. Capacity - how many can use it

3. Land/Space Availability - sensible location, acreage or space needed, conversion possibilities.

4. Safety and Public Health - water, toilets, electricity available.

5. Equity:

   - Use by special population groups (e.g., elderly, young, toddlers, handicapped, singles, and couples).
   - Physical proximity or available transit.
   - No barriers to special population groups.

6. Cost - services should be provided at lowest possible direct cost to locality (entrance fees should be free or low, while user fees, where applicable, should be expected).

7. Environmental quality - while this criteria was stated in the paper, it was stated that environmental quality should not be interpreted too stringently.

The study should look at total space (indoor and outdoor) available and see what activities could take place there (multiple usage and substitutability). There are possbilities for multiple use by place, time of day, and by season.

EXISTING SECONDARY DATA SOURCES

While a number of sources were identified that could be helpful to the study, the group agreed that there are problems with current information sources: limited population examined, incomplete inventory of some facilities, lack of comparable state and areawide data, outdated data, and difficulty in extracting specific community data. Therefore, the group decided that there is a need for a primary survey. However, it was believed that for some facility types, existing information from material or state associations would suffice (e.g., golf courses, marinas, and tennis). The following data sources were suggested by the group:

1. National Recreation and Park Association/International City Management Association 1975 inventory of recreation facilities of 10,000 and over (will be updated in 1979, but data for individual communities may be difficult to extract).

2. National Recreation and Park Association has a listing of all full-time recreation employees at the county, municipal, and special district level who would be appropriate persons for surveyors to contact.

3. State recreation advisory services have been established in 22 states, and many probably have good state data.

4. State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans are updated every 5 years (problems with use in study are that plans only encompass outdoor recreation, private and public activities are included, and some states do a better job of collecting data than others).

5. National Association of Conservation Districts 1977 inventory (Texas was not included, and its focus was different than this study's).

6. 1972 inventory conducted by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (communities under 25,000 population were sampled).

7. Census of Business (may be difficult to extract).
8. HUD 701 plans.
9. Campground directories of state camping associations.
10. Rand-McNally maps.

SOURCES OF ASSITANCE TO THE STUDY

Tennessee Valley Authority
Appalachian Regional Commission and Title V Regional Commissions
Council of Governments
County rural development committees

METHODOLOGIES

There were a number of surces identified and discussed that can help guide Abt in designing a survey instrument. Some of these were discussed and others will be shared with Abt by group members.

Those sources identified include:

1. How Effective Are Your Community Recreation Services?, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, prepared by the Urban Institute (has good bibliography).
2. Evaluation and Self-Study of Recreation Services, National Recreation and Park Association.
3. Assessment of Effectiveness Measures, Center of Leisure Studies.
4. Journal of Leisure Research (index).
5. National Park, Recreation and Open Space Standards, NRPA (will be revised).
6. Outdoor Recreation Space Standards (Kansas City Conference).

Guidelines to surveyors were:

- Break out data according to area, equipment, and facilities
- Identify political subdivisions
- Examine state enabling legislation for recreational services
- Inventory existing resources - who owns it, what is the authority to operate facilities (political, recreation association, etc.)

PRIORITIES FOR STUDY

The study should look at locally-based, community-oriented facilities rather than tourist-oriented ones (e.g., campgrounds). Income-producing facilities should not be excluded, since these are a benefit to the community. The study should concentrate on facilities that provide service to a broad spectrum of the community, and also those that can be used for a major portion of the year. Recreational programs and activities should guide the study, and therefore, the multiple uses of facilities (whether or not they are generally considered recreational) should be considered.

CONCLUSION

The study should be organized around activities and spaces. There are indoor activities and outdoor activities. The study should examine indoor facilities (e.g., community centers); outdoor facilities (e.g., parks, which might include ballfields, courts, and swimming pools); and special purpose/limited demand facilities (e.g., golf courses, skiing).

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

- - -

GROUPS CONTACTED FOR CONFERENCE NOMINATIONS

Page 116 - blank

BIO-SKETCHES OF PARTICIPANTS

NATIONAL RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES ASSESSMENT CONFERENCE

EDUCATION PANEL

Group Facilitator:

Ms. Candice Sullivan
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20208

GORDON A. HOKE
270 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-3771

Rural Sociologist who has conducted a variety of rural studies: mental health needs assessments, impact of 4-H programs, effects of programs designed for marginal income farmers and school-community relations. Currently working on a paper on socio-economic consequences of 4-H programs for the Science and Education Administration, USDA. Recent sabbatical leave focused on "rural Development in Industrial Societies."

HELEN A. KNIEVEL
Northeastern Iowa Regional Library
619 Mulberry Street
Waterloo, IA 50703
(319) 233-1200

Library services consultant to 78 public libraries in Iowa. Communities range in size from 97 to 75,533. Works with non-professional and professional libraries serving communities which are primary trade centers for rural population.

GEORGE W. EYSTER
Appalachian Adult Education Center
Division of Continuing Education
Morehead State University
Morehead, KY 40351
(606) 783-2277

Director of a research project in adult learning and literacy, which is a demonstration of improved practices in the thirteen Appalachian states. The Center has operated for a period of ten years and is recognized as an outstanding rural project. The Center was the winner of the UNESCO Mohammed Reza Pahlavi Prize for meritorious work in world literacy.

Page 118 - blank

DR. JUDY BAZEMORE
Communications Services, Inc.
Box 3142
Spartanburg, SC 29304
(803) 582-4965

Administrator for the Rand Corporation field study in Spartanburg, South Carolina and adjunct professor of graduate studies for the University of South Carolina. President of Communications Services, Inc., a spin-off of the Rand Study in Spartanburg. Since 1970 has done work on model cities in the smallest model city in the U.S. - Alma, Georgia, county population of 8,000. Consultant to rural schools south of Atlanta.

JOHN E. KUSHMAN
Dept. of Agricultural Economics
University of California
Davis, CA 95616
(916) 752-1519

Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics. Specializing in human resource economics. Currently working with a survey of elderly population in seven-county region of California in conjunction with Area Agency on Aging. Member of health care and day care center services. Project leader for agency-university team to develop human needs assessment methodologies.

MARVIN JOHNSON
Dept. of Agricultural Economics
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1450 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706

Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics. Specializing in public economy of local communities.

DONALD OUTLAND
Director of Urban and Regional Studies
Alabama A&M University
Normal, AL 35762

Prior to becoming Chairperson of the Dept. of Community Planning and Urban Studies at A&M, he was Director of Planning at a Council of Local Governments with 400,000 population and only two SMSAs.

AL SAMPLES
Superintendent
Riddle School District
P.O. 45
Riddle, OR 97469
(503) 874-2660

President of the Oregon Small Schools Association - a statewide program for the improvement of instruction in the small (1000 students or less) schools. Riddle is a district with 647 average enrollment, 40 teachers and 3½ administrators. Community expanding which will cause space problems for schools within two years.

SOLID WASTE

Group Facilitator:

Mr. John D. Leslie
FmHA - USDA
Room 4131 - South Building
Washington, DC 20050

LARRY GORDON
Director of Planning
Saratoga County
Municipal Center
Balston Spa, NY 12020
(518) 885-5381

Regional Vice President of National Association of Counties Planning Directors. Director of Saratoga County Sewer, Water and Solid Waste Agency. Director of Saratoga County Police Mobile Radio District and Fire Mutual Aid System. Past President of the New York Association of County Planning Directors.

FLIP McCONNAUGHEY
City Manager
301 S. Gillette Avenue
P.O. Box 3003
Gillette, WY 82716
(307) 686-2222 Ext. 51

City Administrator of Gillette, Wyoming (13,000 population). Gillette is undergoing rapid growth which places a tremendous strain on services delivery capabilities.

RICHARD W. BAKER, Jr.
P.O. Box 160
Harrellsville, NC 27942
(919) 332-3819

Farmer; Assistant Superintendent of Schools; Director of six-county consortium whose primary focus is to improve the quality of life for its citizens through an educational focus and to start a data processing center. Mayor of a small town with experience in initiating FHA-financed water system. Presently negotiating county wide sewage and solid waste disposal systems.

FRANK J. STRANGE
Warren Municipal Building
Warren, PA 16365
(814) 723-6300

Civil Engineer and City Manager for 30 years. Served on County Solid Waste Authority. Experience also in public works projects for rural areas and suburban areas of core cities. (Population 15,000 - 35% Industrial - 10% Commercial Center of a rural country.)

WATER AND WASTEWATER

Group Facilitator:

Mr. Hal Williams
Institute on Man & Science
P.O. Box 65
Rensselaerville, NY 12147

DOUGLAS J. BACON
National Water Well Association
500 West Wilson Bridge Road
Columbus, OH 43201
(614) 846-9355

Research associate at the National Water Well Association's research facility involved in data collection and analysis related to hydrogeologic studies and cost functions of water facilities. Current research focuses on the applicability of ground water source heat pumps on a nationwide scale. Previous experience in the educational field includes teaching mathematics, geology and physics.

ROBERT M. McNICHOLS
County Administrator
143 Third Street, NW
Pulaski, VA 24301
(703) 980-8888

County Administrator of Pulaski County for 8 years, with a county population of 32,000 in Appalachian Virginia. The County of Pulaski operates a countywide water system with an excess of 100 miles of water lines. Served as Chairman of the Rural Development Committee in the National Association of Counties and has testified before Congressional Committees on numerous occasions. Has served as a consultant to the Tennessee Valley Authority on rural matters.

EVERETT S. KRACKOV
2545 Border Links Road
Visalia, CA 93277
(209) 564-2161

For the past 25 years has intermittently served as manager of a small family farming and processing operation in San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys. First Executive-Director of the Tulare County Community Action Agency, 1965-70, which was a pioneer in programs for rural poor and migrant farmworkers. One of the original founders of Self-Help Enterprises, Inc. One of founding directors of the Rural Development Corporation (Statewide California Rural Housing Development Corporation).

JOHN E. FOSTER
Conset Corporation
1134 Corrugated Way
Columbus, OH 43201
(614) 294-5729

Registered professional engineer specializing in civil engineering and facilities development/management. Director for Engineering Services and Field Assistance for National Demonstration Water Project from July 1973 to present. Ohio FmHA Engineer from September 1966 to July 1973 with responsibilities for review and monitoring of water, wastewater and housing development projects. Extensive experience as an engineer in transportation, water, wastewater, development and management during past 17 years, with emphasis on rural development during last 12 years.

GEORGE PAZ
Dona Ana Water Development and Support
Corporation
575 South Alameda
Room 205
Las Cruces, NM 88001
(505) 524-9220

Statewide development of water and wastewater facilities in rural communities. Developed new, upgraded or repaired community water and/or sewer systems plus established 2 non-profit development & support companies to perform operations and maintenance plus central management of these systems. Private engineering consultant for 18 years. Past President of the National Demonstration Water Project.

DAVID ALLEE
218 Warren Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
(607) 256-6550

Professor of Resource Economics. Has conducted studies on rural water and sewer problems, flood plain and drainage management. Formerly Associate Director of the Cornell Water Resources Center. Chairman of Cornell Land Use Committee and Real Property Task Force. Member of Cooperative Extension Service. Active in various national organizations of university and water resource interest. Fifth term on village trustee; active in development of new sewer and water facilities. Governor Carey's Advisor for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

JON ELAM
Rural Cities Administration Program
P.O. Box 246
Walnut Grove, MN 56180

City Manager of cities of Lucan, Milroy, Wabasso, Nanborn and Walnut Grove, Minnesota - total population 2,500. The cities have collectively undertaken 11 separate FmHA projects in the last 4 years. National Consultant in Water and Sewer and Rural Housing. For the last four years one of the nations first circuit riding city managers.

WILLIAM FRENCH
Rural Community Assistance Corporation
1900 K Street
Suite 202
Sacramento, CA 95814

Executive Director of Rural Community Assistance Corporation. Has worked over 10 years in rural development including self-help housing, rural housing, sewer and water facility development and legislative action. Developed a program which has assisted over 50 rural communities to solve water/sewer problems. RCAC is about to expand this effort throughout the western states in a Community Services Administration funded Rural Community Assistance program.

ROBERT R. ROBINSON
Michigan Townships Association
3121 West Saginaw
Lansing, MI 48917
(517) 321-6467

Executive Director, Michigan Townships Association. President, National Association of Towns and Townships.

ENERGY

Group Facilitator:

Mr. Jack Roll
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02136

JOSE M. RODRIGUEZ
Kit Carson Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P.O. Box 587
Taos, NM 87571
(505) 758-2258

Employed by Kit Carson Electric Cooperative, Taos, New Mexico, since 1960, as Office Manager, Administrative Assistant and General Manager (6 years). Cooperative has been active in rural development in a rapidly growing area which is predominantly Spanish-American. Taos is a community of 5,100 with Taos Indian Reservation nearby.

HOWARD D. BETHEL
Sulfur Springs Valley Electric Coop
P.O. Box 820
Willcox, AZ 85643
(602) 384-2221

Manager of Electric Cooperative for 7 years. Incorporator and President of Northern Cochise Community Hospital. Incorporator and President of County Comprehensive Health Planning Council. Incorporator and President of Cochise Visitor Center and Museum of Southwest. Director, County Industrial Commission. Director of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Member of Arizona Water Quality Control Council. Member of Governor's Energy Advisory Committee.

DENNIS ENGELKE
Director, Rural Development
Texas Rural Electric Cooperative
8140 Burnet Road
P.O. Box 9589
Austin, TX 78766
(512) 454-0311

Director of rural development. Work includes assisting member service personnel in improving cooperative consumer relations and work in community development activities. Has also worked with the Texas Association of rural water corporations. Previously worked as field representative in the Texas Dept. of Community Affairs.

PHILIP HARRIS
Maine State Planning Office
184 State Street
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-3261

Currently directing Maine's FmHA funded State Rural Development strategy; prepared Maine's adopted Housing Plan; staffed Governor's Task Force on Substate Districts; headed State effort to encourage federal financing of energy efficient housing; directs State Socio-Economic Data Center; coordinates state review of National Urban and Rural Legislation Programs; served on White House Task Force on review of Federal Planning requirements.

FERD L. HARRISON
Mayor
P.O. Box 176
Scotland Neck, NC 27874
(919) 826-3111

Mayor of a community of 2,869 for over 20 years. Was a past president and served on the Boards of North Carolina League of Municipalities (9 years) and the Electricities of North Carolina (7 years). Served on the Board of the National League of Cities and its small cities Advisory Council for 3 years.

SAMUEL J. SALKIN
Department of Rural Sociology
432 Warren Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Extension assistant, New York Cooperative Extension. Intervenor in public utility rate cases. Member of Municipal Electric Power Task Force, Common Council, City of Ithaca, New York. Co-author of forthcoming book on municipal electric power systems.

ROGER BLOBAUM
1340 42nd
Suite A
West Des Moines, IA 50265
(515) 225-6035

Chairman of Rural America, Inc. Professional work focuses on energy and agriculture. Has been a consultant in the recent series of regional small farm conferences sponsored jointly by the Department of Agriculture, Community Services Administration and ACTION.

JACQUELINE M. BERNIER
Lawrence Berkeley Lab
Building 90, Room 3111
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Consultant to Lawrence Berkeley Lab's Energy and Environment Division (conservation). Studying the potential for using alternative/appropriate technologies to provide electricity, space conditioning, portable and hot water, and liquid and solid waste treatment/disposal to boomtown communities impacted by the development of energy resources.

COMMUNICATIONS

Group Facilitator:

Ms. Peg Kay
National Rural Center
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

LUANNE T. VISSER
Northwest Minnesota Telecommunications, Inc.
425 Woodland Avenue
Crookston, MN 56716
(218) 281-6383

Project coordinator for Northwest Minnesota Telecommunications, Inc.

DONNA M. MERTENS
Appalachian Education Satellite Program
University of Kentucky
302 Bradley Hall
Lexington, KY 40506
(606) 258-4615

Consultant to the study "Public Television Service in Rural America" submitted to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in conjunction with the Public Service Satellite Consortium of the Appalachian Regional Commission September, 1978. Experience coordinating the evaluation of the Appalachian Education Satellite Program, including extensive involvement in needs assessment activities.

CAROL BROWN EILBER
University of Wisconsin-Extension
610 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 262-3566

Currently Assistant Professor in Radio/TV/Cable TV Communications. Works with the Educational Telephone Network (ETN) to extend educational programming to rural communities. Designs and implements continuing education programs in communications field. Serves on various cable television boards and councils as a consumer.

EDDIE L. PENA
Tele-Vu, Inc.
216 North 2nd Street
Grants, NM 87020
(505) 287-9451

Tele-Vu, Inc. is a telephone cooperative which serves 3 franchise communities in New Mexico -- Grants, (14,000 population), Milan (5,000 population) and Socorro (7,500 population), and rural places -- San Rafael (1,500), Golden Acres (300) and Mt. Taylor Addition (500). All except Socorro are fast growing due to uranium and coal mining in the area.

CRAIG LISKE
Institute for Policy Research
WESTPO
3333 Quebec Street
Denver, CO 80207
(303) 399-9957

Director of Programs and Research at the Institute of Policy Research of Western Governors' Policy Office (WESTPO). Has directed the design and conduct of various research and policy development projects for the 10 WESTPO governors, including a current study of rural telecommunications needs in the WESTPO states. Previously served on the staff of Congressman Tim Wirth and has taught graduate public policy courses at several universities.

PATRICIA GARCIA
1776 On The Green
Morristown, NJ 07960
(201) 540-6815

Residence Marketing Supervisor at the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Involved with concept development work for studies of residential customer need.

BOB BOALDIN
Elkhart Telephone Company
Box 817
Elkhart, KS 67950
(316) 697-2111

Owner and manager of a telephone and cable television system. Has operated a telephone system for 20 years and a cable system for about 2 years.

JUSTICE

Group Facilitator:

Mr. Dennis Kleinsasser
St. John's University
Center for Human & Community Development
Collegeville, MN 56321

WILLIAM S. FORT
815 Willacade Court
Springfield, OR 97477
(503) 747-4495

American Bar Association Juvenile Justice Standards Project. Institute on Judicial Administration - American Bar Association. Past President National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

SUSAN M. SAETRE
Arrowhead Regional Development Commission
200 Arrowhead Place
Duluth, MN 55802
(218) 722-5545

Manager of the criminal justice program. Planning experience for five years in 2 large, development regions in Minnesota, both of which are primarily rural. Main emphasis is placed on law enforcement, corrections, juvenile planning, management of small police departments, consolidation of police

(Susan M. Saetre Continued)

departments, training needs for Criminal Justice Agencies and Criminal Justice legislation.

OTIS N. LaBREE
Penobscot County Sheriff
85 Hammond Street
Bangor, ME 04401
(207) 947-4585

Sheriff of Penobscot County and Project Director of the Rural Law Enforcement Assistance Program which has received national recognition through LEAA Discretionary Grant Funding. First Sheriff in Maine to be a recipient of Executive Certificate awarded to Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's. Graduate and Past President of Harvard Associates in Police Sciences.

WILLIAM R. CORBETT
Corbett Services
P.O. Box 3388
Austin, TX 78764
(512) 477-6042

Currently a private real estate broker. Previously a criminal justice coordinator for the Regional Council of Governments, also worked for the office of the Governor on criminal justice issues. Former Director of Texas Crime Prevention Program.

WILLIAM H. HUFF
Hall County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Drawer 1435
Gainesville, GA 30501
(404) 536-6681, Ext. 267

Community Planner for Hall County. Capital projects development and growth identification activities. Has been involved in such rural development fields as: jails, law enforcement, adult offender rehabilitation, water systems, sewer systems, fire protection, solid waste collection and disposal, and industrial district development.

JUDSON BRYANT
Judicial Council of Georgia
Administrative Office of the Courts
84 Peachtree Street
Suite 500
Atlanta, GA 30303

Judicial Facility Consultant to State of Georgia, architect by profession. Directed the effort to establish Georgia Judicial Facilities standards and space standards and design guidelines for state of Nebraska. Helped design, provide facility and programming needs analysis for 60-70 courthouses around the nation.

STEVE PERCY
Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis
814 E. 3rd Street
Bloomington, IN 47401
(812) 337-0441

Recently involved in National Science Foundation study of police service delivery in metropolitan areas. Currently working on LEAA funded study of police performance measurement theory.

DEBRA HOPLEINSON
702 South 8th Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
(406) 586-3819

Lived in Montana for 7 years and was Director of the Great Falls Runaway Program for 2½ years. Helped to coordinate and organize Mountain Plains Youth Services Coalition. Has worked with Crime Attack Team and Youth Development Bureau on the reorganization of the Great Falls Juvenile Justice System. Has been involved in planning on state level with Montana Board of Crime Control. Has been Steering Council member of National Network of Runaway and Youth Services.

RICHARD D. SINGLETON
Box #14
Conesville, IA 52739
(319) 728-3434

Mayor 8 years. Board of League of Iowa. Municipalities 6 years. National League of Cities Small Cities Advisory Countil. Area 7 Representative to Policy Committee. NLC Member of Public Safety.

F.L. (LEE) SMITH
Marketing Supervisor
AT&T
Morristown, NJ 07960

Responsible for AT&T's market support planning and strategies in criminal justice/public safety maket segment.

HEALTH

Group Facilitator:

Ms. Alice Hersh
National Rural Center
1828 L Street
Washington, DC 20036

PETER PRUESSING
Route 1
Darlington, WI 53530
(608) 776-4466

Administrator of the Lafayette County Memorial Hospital and Executive Director of Lafayette County Community Health, Inc., a multi-site group practice primary care program in integrating medical and support services in a health underserved area.

ELIZABETH D. FOOTE
Colorado Dept. of Health
4210 E. 11th Avenue
Denver, CO 80220
(303) 320-8333 Ext. 3720

Assistant Director of Colorado Dept. of Health. Responsibilities include: rural policy, rural health legislation, rural clinics, migrant health, nutrition, and all other health service programs. Office has prepared numerous rural policy papers for governors.

LINDA S. HART
HQS11B
Control Data Corporation
Box 0
Minneapolis, MN 55440
(612) 853-3307

Presently working as Rural/Indian health consultant for Control Data Corporation. Has worked in rural Tennessee 5 years as family nurse practitioner in a network of 4 clinics (United Health Services).

MICHAEL HAMM
Assistant Director
Center for Small and Rural Hospitals
American Hospital Association
846 North Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 645-9619

Assistant Director of the Center for Small or Rural Hospitals at the American Hospital Association. Writer for the Small and Rural Hospital Report, a bimonthly newsletter for small or rural hospitals. Former director of project review for the North Central Area Health Planning Association in Wausau, Wisconsin. Former price stabilization analyst at the Clinical Center of the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, Maryland.

JEANNETTE L. BURROUGHS
American Development Corp.
2399 Air Park Road
Charleston, SC 29405
(803) 744-4241

Presently Marketing Associate, American Development Corporation. Formerly Health Administrator, Sea Island Comprehensive Health Care Corporation.

TERRY ALFORD
Planning & Design Associates
3515 Glenwood Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27612
(919) 821-4949

President of Planning and Design Associates, P.A. a multi-specialty planning, design, and management firm. Former Planning Coordinator for the North Carolina Office of Rural Health Services, he played a key role in the development of the 20 rural primary care programs initiated by that office.

DAN CARDENAS
National Migrant Referral Project, Inc.
4920 North IH35
Suite 116
Austin, TX 78751
(512) 454-4523

Director of the HEW Migrant Health Medical Referral System for 7 years. Texas has 375,000 migrants, 95% of which are Chicano and are generally underemployed, ill-housed and in need of comprehensive health care.

LOYD KEPFERLE
Mountain States Health Corporation
P.O. Box 6756
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 342-4666

General Director of the Mountain States Health Corporation (MSHC). Developed programs for training long-term care Administrators in Nevada and Wyoming. MSHC is currently involved in 4 rural health programs including Geriatric Nurse Practitioners, Child Abuse, EMT Training, and Rural Health Capacity Building. The Mountain States Health Corporation has projects in Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming, Washington and Oregon.

CLINTON A. CONANT
Rural Health Associates
Farmington, ME 04938
(207) 778-6521

Executive Director of Rural Health Associates. Former Extension Agent in charge of 4-H programs. Former Community Action Council Director in charge of poverty programs.

RANDALL HEMPLING
Health Planning Association
of Western Kansas, Inc.
1010 East 17th
Hays, KS 67601
(913) 628-2868

Executive Director of Health Systems Agency serving 54 western Kansas counties (46,000 sq. miles, 430,000 population, no SMSA). Responsible for health planning and resource development including needs assessment and some quasi-regulatory functions. Worked as Human Resources Director for Nortex RPC (12 north Texas counties) which included EMS, Health Planning, Drug Abuse, Alcoholism, Aging and CETA programs in a predominantly rural area for five years.

ALICE MORGANFIELD
Lee County Cooperative Clinic
530 West Atkins Boulevard
Marianna, AR 72360
(501) 295-5225

Director, Administrative Services/Director, Meals on Wheels Transportation for the Elderly. As Director of Administration Services one of many functions is to direct LCCC's transportation system.

WARREN YOUNGDAHL
Vice President
Minnesota Association of Townships
P.O. Box 7
Marcell, MN 56657
(218) 832-3421

Marcell Township Supervisor, a recreation area with 460 population. Director of the Itasca County Township Association, Vice President and Director of the Minnesota Association of Township Officers, Director and Vice Chairman of the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission and a Member of the Governor's Rural Development Council.

SAFETY

Group Facilitator:

Mr. George Morse
Ohio State University
2 Ludlow Avenue
Athens, OH 45701

JOE LYNN
Upper Cumberland Regional Health Office
P.O. Box 5033
Cooksville, TN 38501
(615) 528-5535

Six years with Emergency Medical Services developing an EMS system to fucntion for ten rural counties with little outside funding assistance.

WILLIAM PETERSON
Bureua of Fire Prevention
460 East Briarcliff Road
Bolingbrook, IL 60439
(312) 739-0484

President of Illinois Fire Inspector's Association. Technical consultant of the National Fire Administration, Program for Rural and Urban Fire Protection Master Planning. Fire Marshal for the Village of Bolingbrook, 38,000 population. The community is one of the fastest developing areas in the Midwest.

JIM MURRAY
Chief, Wyoming State Emergency Medical
  Services Program
Hathaway Building, Room 482
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-7955

Chief of the Emergency Medical Services in Wyoming with the Department of Health. Responsible for supervision and control of all activities in the area of emergency medical services. Affiliate-Faculty instructor trainer for the Wyoming Heart Association, member of the Wyoming Trauma Committee of the American College of Surgeons, founding member of the National Association of EMTs, charter member of the National Registry, State Coordinator for the Wyoming MAST helicopter program.

DAVID W. SCHIRLE
Star Route Box 74-3
Hazelhurst, WI 54531
(715) 356-9619

Public facility planning Consultant for an Architectural firm. Taught facility planning and public purchasing for the University of Wisconsin. Experience in helping rural fire departments throughout Wisconsin for 25 years, both paid and voluntary. Has administered the Rural Fire Protection (RCFD) Grant Program in Wisconsin since it's inception. He is currently coordinator - Fire Service Training at Nicolet College, Rhinelander, Wisconsin.

BRUCE A. WEBER
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
(503) 754-4821

Assistant Professor of Agricultural and Resource Economics. Develops statewide educational programs on costs of alternative methods of providing rural fire protection in Oregon. Five years experience doing extension work and research in the economics of local government and rural public services.

EUGENE F. McNAMARA
Department of Environmental Resources
P.O. Box 1467
Harrisburg, PA 17120
(717) 787-2925

Professional forester since 1950. Since 1966, Chief of the Division of Forest and Fire Protection - responsible for administering Rural Community Fire Protection Section of Rural Development Act of 1972.

LOIS MacGILLIVRAY
Research Triangle Institute
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
(919) 541-6348

Director of Center for Population and Urban-Rural Studies at Research Triangle Institute. Project leader for evaluating fire service delivery organizations. The project evaluating local fire service delivery performance included

(Lois MacGillivray Continued)

over 600 communities with 10,000 population or less. A second project measures fire protection in rural communities and open rural areas.

DENIS CARO, Ph.D.
1308 Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55414
(612) 331-9971

Evaluation Consultant in Emergency Medical Services, Department of Health, State of Minnesota. Evaluation of information system in emergency medical services for the State of Minnesota. Recommendations and implementation of information system support for EMS strategic planning. Technical assistance provided on a number of related EMS projects. Formerly, Health Care research trainee, Department of National Health and Welfare, Canada.

HOUSING

Group Facilitator:

Mr. K.Z. Chavis
Arlin, Inc.
P.O. Drawer A
Red Oak, NC 27868

JOHN BURKE
Florida Dept. of Community Affairs
2571 Executive Center Circle East
Tallahassee, FL 33201

Community Development and Housing Specialist at the Florida Dept. of Community Affairs. Previously a city Administrator in Wakala County, Florida. Responsible for personnel, community development and housing. First professional employee for city.

PATRICK SABELHAUS
921 10th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-0836

Chief of the Community Affiars Division, California Department of Housing and Community Development. Previously worked as a consultant to the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development in Washington. Former Assistant Director of Rural Housing Alliance.

ROBERT C. VANCE
Executive Director
Owens Valley Indian Housing Authority
P.O. Box 324
Big Pine, CA 93513
(714) 983-2485

Executive Director of the Owens Valley Indian Housing Authority. Owens Valley serves six different communities with populations ranging from 60 to 750 people. Each of these communities have very little economic or commercial development.

ROBERT W. KNIGHT
Northwest Kansas Planning and Development
P.O. Box 248
Hill City, KS 67642
(913) 674-2151

Rural planner working with a 19 county, agricultural region which has 75 cities varying in size from less than 100 persons to 18,000. Experience in almost every aspect of rural community development, including planning, transportation and housing. Has conducted a rural community/housing development assistance project, resulting in 11 FmHA Section 515 projects and 3 HUD Section 202 projects, all in various stages of application and development.

BARBARA OSGOOD
Dept. of Consumer Economics and Housing
121 MVR Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Housing sociologist on the faculty of the Department of Consumer Economics and Housing, Cornell University. Research interests include housing for the elderly, community participation in government housing programs and housing in flood plains.

GARY A. EIDE
City Manager
300 North Coal
Mexico, MO 65265
(314) 581-2100

City Manager of a city with a population of 12,400. The City has averaged 70 new single family homes per year and 56 multiple units this year. The City has developed its first industrial park and located its first new industry in 25 years. Also has undertaken an extensive neighborhood redevelopment program, including housing rehabilitation together with street, sanitary and storm sewer improvements.

BARRY F. DRISCOLL
Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs
State of Vermont
Pavilion Building
Montepelier, VT 05602
(802) 828-3217

Chief of Housing Planning. Five years experience in urban renewal and community development activities especially as this relates to housing. Vermont is one of the most rural states in the nation.

BEN LUCKENS
Housing Development Specialist
Texas Housing Development Corp.
221 E. Ninth Street
Suite 203
Austin, TX 78701

Development specialist with Texas Housing Development Corp., provides training and technical assistance to Texas CAA's in all aspects of Housing,

(Ben Luckens Continued)

weatherization and appropriate technology programs and programming. Texas Housing Development Corp's primary focus is on rural Texas.

GLADYS ELISON
Five Valleys District Council
Missoula County Courthouse
Missoula, MT 59801
(406) 728-0820

Executive Director of Five Valleys District Council for the past three years. Prepared District Economic Development Plan for designation as an Economic Development District. Council is a three council of governments, population approximately 95,000, area approximately 13,000 square miles. Rural areas relatively depressed, low-median income, with higher than average unemployment.

NELSON J. GLASGOW
P.O. Box 965
Kirksville, MO 63501

Former presiding judge of the county court in Clarks County. Owns and operates a 555 acre combination grain and livestock farm. At the present time is the Executive Director of the Northeast Missouri Regional Planning & Economic Development Commission, which consists of five counties. Operates a Regional housing Authority, Section 8 housing. Has started and seen completed 15 FmHA housing associations and 3 HUD housing authorities and various other programs.

TRANSPORTATION

Group Facilitator:

Mr. David J. Cyra
Office of Statewide Transportation Programs
Division of Outreach
UW Extension
Milwaukee, WI 53211

ROBERT LEWIS
Texas Department of Highways and Public
Transportation
2607 Berkeley Avenue
Austin, TX 78745
(512) 475-3351

Chief Engineer for the Texas Department of Highways and Public Transportation's Highway Design Division. Serves on committees of the Transportation Research Board, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, as well as numerous intradepartmental committees. Was the chairman of the Special AASHTO Task Force appointed to develop a National Transportation Policy for that organization and a member of the subsequent AASHTO Funding Task Force.

ROBERT W. HARPSTER
League of Iowa Municipalities
900 Des Moines Street
Suite 100
Des Moines, IA 50316
(515) 265-9961

Executive Director of the League of Iowa Municipalities. Serves as City Representative on State Transportation Advisory Council, State Energy Advisory Task Force. Active in Small Cities Advisory Council (SCAC), National League of Cities. Member of Effective Government Steering Committee, National League of Cities. Organization co-sponsored first state legislation on rural community development.

MELVIN B. LARSEN
Illinois Department of Transportation
2300 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764
(217) 782-3805

Bureau Chief of the Bureau of Local Roads and Streets of the Illinois Department of Transportation. Member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, National Society of Professional Engineers, President of the Transportation Officials Division of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, secretary of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' NACO-NACE Joint Committee, Chairman of the Transportation Research Board Committee on Low Volume Roads and a member of the Illinois Professional Engineers' Examining Committee.

EDSON L. TENNYSON
Pennsylvania Bureau of Rail Systems
1207 Transportation and Safety Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120
(717) 787-8197

Deputy Secretary of Pennsylvania DOT in charge of local & area transportation, encompassing aid to municipal roads, operation of state airports, aid to other public airports, and purchase of service to sustain 49 rural rail lines, 18 public transit authorities and developing rural transit systems. Contracts with 83 transit systems for free off-peak rides for the elderly. Member of the American Railway Engineering Association, Transportation Research Board Committee, American Public Transit Association and licensed professional engineer.

ORRIN P. JUEL
Mayor
Box 399
Brookings, SD 57006
(605) 692-2931

Mayor of Brookings, South Dakota for eight and a half years (17,000 population). Chairman of Brookings Planning Commission. Chairman for two years of the First Planning District in South Dakota. Member of the Small Cities Advisory Council of the National League of Cities. Member of the Advisory Council to South Dakota Governor. President of the South Dakota Municipal League in 1977.

JOHN D. ANTHONY
Executive Director
Region VI Planning and Development Council
201 Deveny Building
Fairmont, WV 26554
(304) 366-5693

Executive Director of the Region VI Planning and Development Council for the past 6 years. Member of the National Association of Regional Council's Non-metropolitan Development Policy Committee. Has extensive experience in planning and operation of rural systems, including sewer, water, solid waste, transportation, housing rehabilitation, and emergency medical services.

GERALD I. COOGAN
Executive Director
North Country Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 40
Franconia, NH 03580
(603) 823-8108

Executive Director of the North Country Council, Inc. There are 51 municipalities in the region varying in size from 14 to 14,500. Population growth is slow, and the area suffers from high unemployment, underemployment and out-migration.

E. EVAN BRUNSON
Southern Growth Policies Board
P.O. Box 12293
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
(919) 549-8167

Director of Research for the Southern Growth Policies Board. Project Director of USDA funded study of Small Cities and Rural Communities in the South. Former Research Analyst, Editor and Director of Information of National Area Development Institute.

DOUG COCHRAN
Arizona State University
College of Business Administration
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 965-6403

Professor of Business at Arizona State University. Has conducted research on small community air services and other modes of rural transportation.

LOUIS HONEBRINK, JR.
Rural Route 1, Box 49
Mayer, MN 55360
(612) 657-2379

President of the Minnesota Association of Township Officers. Farmer, and Township Supervisor since 1958.

LEE JANE REAM
Texas Research and Development Foundation
2602 Dellana Lane
Austin, TX 78746
(512) 327-4211

Project Engineer for Texas Research and Development Foundation on FHWA contract for the Local Rural Road Problem.

JANET E. ST. MARK
SMS Associates, Inc.
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 701
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-8705

Consultant in transportation and small business issues; Executive Vice-President of Commuter Airline Association; Vice-President of National Air Transportation Association; Deputy Director of Presidential Task Force on Women Business Owners; Member of Special Committ-e on Air Transport Activities, Transportation Research Board; Specialist in Small Community Air Service problems and needs.

INDUSTRIAL PARKS

Group Facilitator:

William Bivens
Policy Development Unit
Farmers Home Administration - EDA
14th and Independence Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20250

VERNON D. MARTIN
Executive Director
Coastal Area Planning and Development Commission
P.O. Box 1316
Brunswick, GA 31250
(912) 264-7363

President, National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) and Executive Director of Coastal Area Planning and Development Commission, Brunswick, Georgia. NADO is a national membership organization of economic development districts representing approximately 60% of the U.S. CAPDC is the reponsible regional agency serving the entire coast of Georgia including 8 counties and 23 units of local government.

WILLIAM E. DAVIS
1011 Andrew Jackson Building
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 741-2373

Director, Community Facilities, Department of Economic and Community Development, State of Tennessee. Primary responsibility for selecting industrial sites, design and financing of sites and then development. Extensive experience with the Economic Development Administration including Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Special Assistant for Field Operations, and Director of Mid-Eastern Region.

BRADY J. DEATON
Department of Agricultural
  Economics
VPI & SU
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(703) 961-5381

Associate professor of Extension at VPI & SU as a specialist in rural development. Completed a number of studies of rural industrial location and expansion and the role of industrial plant sites in this process. Presently coordinating the Virginia Rural Development Project in "Southside", Virginia.

EDWARD B. BURGESS
South Carolina Development Board
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 758-3145

Associate Director for Planning and Research of S.C. State Development Board. Ten years of industrial development planning, participating in the managing research activities including inventorying community resources, industrial properties and other factors related to business and industrial development. Past Charman of the Research Division of the National Association of State Development Agencies.

SID R. PETERS
National Association of Office and
  Industrial Parks
1901 N. Fort Myers Dr.
Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 525-5638

Executive Vice President of the National Association of Industrial and Office Parks. Former President of Brandywine College, Wilmington, Delaware, and former developer Conference Center, Second Home, Recreation Facility - "Martingham."

JOHN B. MOORE, Jr.
Department of Economics and
  Community Development
State of Maryland
Annapolis, MD
(301) 269-3265

Director of the Division of Local and Regional Development of the Department of Economic and Community Development, State of Maryland.

JIM ROBERSON
Vice President and Director of New Business
  Development
Rouse Company
Howard Research & Development Corporation Bldg.
Columbia, MD 21044
(301) 992-6000

Responsible for attracting new businesses to the new community of Columbia, MD. Also, Economic Development experience in Colorado, New Mexico and Rhode Island.

RECREATION

Group Facilitator:

Dr. Karl Munson
Program Leader for Recreation
Community Rural Development
Cooperative Extension Service
USDA
14th & Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20520

DOUGLAS A. NIEMOND
Superintendent of Recreation
Chambersburg Recreation Department
Chambersburg, PA 17201
(717) 264-4931

Chambersburg Recreation Department Services Borough of Chambersburg of approximately 20,000 plus the Chambersburg Area School District of an additional 25,000 population which is rural. Helped compile PA Recreation Survey. Also has served as Recreation Consultant to several Pennsylvania Planning Associations in conducting community recreation surveys.

ROGER A. LANCASTER
National Recreation & Park
  Association
1601 North Kent Street
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 525-0606

Currently, Director of Research of the National Recreation & Park Association. Formerly, Executive Secretary, Society of Park & Recreation Educators. Instructor, Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Recreation Consultant, Government of British Columbia, Canada.

SANDRA S. BATIE
312 Hutcheson Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute &
  State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

An assistant professor of agricultural economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Research interests include recreation economics, land use economics and water use economics.

BILL SAPP
Director - Treasurer
Lumberton Recreation Commission
P.O. Box 758
Lumberton, NC 28358
(919) 738-1411

Thirty years public recreation experience. Served as Director-Treasurer of Lumberton Recreation Commission since 1955. Responsible for administration of department to include budgeting, program, maintenance, planning, etc.

RON DOWNS
Director of Parks and Recreation
Route , Box 98-A
Rocky Mount, VA 24151
(703) 483-1251

Serves as Director of Franklin County Parks and Recreation. Previously, was assistant director. Has served as chairperson of several committees of the Virginia Recreation and Parks Society.

JACK "SWEDE" FRAUSON
3143 Wrightsville Avenue
Wilmington, NC 28401
(919) 762-3394

Provide consulting services and technical assistance to the Park & Recreation interest in North Carolina (75 E. Counties): Assistance includes Federal & State Assistance, Personnel information, Training workshops, Studies, Planning, Scorp update: Provide this sentence to the Public & Private & Commercial sectors. Previously served as Regional Director, National Recreation & Park Association, S.E. Region Atlanta, GA.

HOMER D. GRAY
Recreation Services Section
Department of National Resources
270 Washington Street, Room 704
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-2790

Provides technical assistance to local governments concerning recreation. Assistance includes such things as; information on organization, administration, establishment and funding of full-time and part-time parks and recreation departments; publications; training and workshops; studies; available jobs information; speeches; promotion of standards and professionalism; etc.

GROUPS CONTACTED FOR CONFERENCE NOMINATIONS

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
American Bar Association
American Health Planning Association
American Hospital Association
American Industrial Development Council
American Library Association
American Public Works Association
American Society of Planning Officials
Booker T. Washington Foundation Cable Television Information Center
Council of State Community Affairs Agencies
Council of State Planning Agencies
Department of Transportation - EMS
Farmers Home Administration
Forest Service
Housing Assistance Council
Institute for Local Self-Reliance
International City Management Association
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Association of Community Health Centers
National Association of Counties
National Association of Development Organizations
National Association of Farmworker Organizations
National Association of Office and Industrial Parks
National Association of Regional Councils
National Association of Smaller Communities
National Association of State Development Agencies
National Association of Towns and Townships
National Center for State Courts
National Center for Appropriate Technology
National Congress for Community Economic Development
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Council on Aging
National Council of La Raza
National Demonstration Water Project
National Fire Prevention and Control Administration
National Governors Association
National Indian Health Board, Inc.
National Institute of Corrections - Jail Center
National Network of Runaway and Youth Services
National League of Cities
National Recreation and Park Association
National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association
National Rural Water Association
North Central Regional Center for Rural Development
Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
Organization for Protection and Assistance of Small Telephone Companies
Rural America, Inc.
Rural Electrification Administration
Society of Industrial Realtors
Southern Rural Development Center
Transportation Research Board
United Indian Planners Association
United States Independent Telephone Companies
Western Rural Development Center

FEDERAL PARTICIPANTS

Vincent P. Rock
USDA-FmHA
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20052

Norman Paulhus, Jr.
U.S. Department of
Transportation
400 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20590

Nancy M. Lane
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20235

D.C. Kirkman
HUD - Room 8130
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590

Frederick Burks
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20235

Robert Solokowski
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20235

Raymond Riggs
Ozarks Regional Commission
1100 N. University, Suite 109
Little Rock, AR 72207

John E. Subat
USDA - OBPE, Room 120A
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20050

Robert F. Clark
Community Services Administration
1200 - 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Louis Bennett
USDA-FmHA
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20050

John Bowles
USDA-FmHA
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20050

John W. Overby
U.S. Fire Administration
P.O. Box 19518
2400 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Linda Maloof
New England Regional Commission
Room 2606 Main Commerce Building
Washington, DC

George I. Freedman
BHFFCC/HRA/Dept. HEW
3700 East-West Highway
Hyattsville, MD 20781

William Fox
USDA - Room 491
500 - 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20250

John J. Roberts
Argonne National Laboratory
Argonne, IL 60439

Bill Lawson
FmHA
Temple, TX 76501

Richard Ackley
USDA-FmHA, Room 6327 South Building
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20250

Louis D. Higgs
FmHA, Room 4116 South Building
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20250

Gerry Anderson
REA
2711 Pine Shadows
Huntsville, TX 77340

Stuart H. Huntington
Four Corners Regional Commission
Room 1898-C Commerce Building
Washington, DC 20230

Joseph Gabbard
Ozarks Regional Commission
1100 N. University, Suite 109
Little Rock, AR 72211

Byron E. Ross
FmHA-USDA
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20050

Eugene Ingold
Old West Regional Commission
1730 K Street, NW - Suite 426
Washington, DC 20006

Russell Gibler
FmHA-USDA
14th & Indpendence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20050

A. L. Miller
EDA
600 American Bank Tower
221 W. 6th Street
Austin, TX 70701

Hugh Farmer
EDA - 600 American Bank Tower
221 W. 6th Street
Austin, TX 70701

Richard Levy
USDA - 4128 S. Building
Washington, DC 20250

James Lyons
HCRS - Dept. of the Interior
Washington, DC 20240

Fredrick R. Young
FmHA-USDA
Washington, DC 20250

Donald R. Sherrill
FmHA-USDA
Washington, DC 20250

Jack Harmon
FmHA-USDA
500 - 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20012

David Kelch
ESCS-USDA
500 - 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20012

Gene Kaufman
Office of Public Works - EDA
Main Commerce Building
Washington, DC 20230